

Division BS1192
.044
v. 2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

OLD TESTAMENT AND SEMITIC STUDIES

IN MEMORY OF

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER


OLD TESTAMENT AND SEMITIC STUDIES

IN MEMORY OF

William Rainey Harper

EDITED BY

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER
FRANCIS BROWN
GEORGE FOOT MOORE



VOLUME TWO

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1908

COPYRIGHT 1908 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Published January the tenth, 1908

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME TWO

	PAGES
A TEXT-CRITICAL APPARATUS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER	1-52
LEWIS BAYLES PATON	
THE APPARATUS FOR THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH	53-112
CHARLES CUTLER TORREY	
CRITICAL NOTES ON ESTHER	113-204
PAUL HAUPT	
CRITICAL NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES . .	205-226
JULIUS A. BEWER	
THE ORIGIN OF SOME CUNEIFORM SIGNS	227-258
GEORGE A. BARTON	
THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH	259-278
CHARLES PROSPERO FAGNANI	
AN OMEN SCHOOL TEXT	279-326
MORRIS JASTROW, JR.	
THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE PARABLE OF ENOCH	327-350
NATHANIEL SCHMIDT	
DHIMMIS AND MOSLEMS IN EGYPT	351-414
RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL	
THE STROPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF MICAH	415-438
JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH	

A TEXT-CRITICAL APPARATUS TO THE
BOOK OF ESTHER

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

A TEXT-CRITICAL APPARATUS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

The Book of Esther in the numerous versions and recensions presents so many striking differences from the Massoretic form of the text that it has seemed to me worth while to gather the variant readings and present them in a complete text-critical apparatus. For this purpose I have made use of the following sources:

- ℵ = Codex Sinaiticus, according to Swete, *The O. T. in Greek*, 1896.
- A = Codex Alexandrinus, according to Swete.
- Ald = The Aldine text of Ⲭ, according to Holmes and Parsons, *Vet. Test. Graec. cum Variis Lectionibus*, III, 1823.
- B = Codex Vaticanus, according to Swete.
- Ba = Baer and Delitzsch, *Quinque Volumina*, 1886.
- Br = The Pentateuch, Five Megilloth and Haphtaroth, Brescia, 1492, according to Ginsburg, *Massoretico-Critical O. T.*, 1894.
- B¹ = Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, Venice, 1516-17.
- B² = Bomberg Rabbinic Bible with Massora, Venice, IV, 1526, according to Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906, and Ginsburg.
- BT = Babylonian Talmud.
- C = Complutensian Polyglot, Alcalá, 1514-17.
- Ⲭ = The Greek Version as represented by the uncials and the cursives, except L.
- G = Ginsburg, *Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, 1894.
- H = The Hesychian recension of Ⲭ, represented in general by codd. 44, 68, 71, 74, 76, 106, 107, 120, 236.
- 𐤀 = The consonantal Hebrew text.
- ℒ = The Latin version of Jerome, or Vulgate.
- Jos = Josephus, *Antiquities*, xi.
- JT = Jerusalem Talmud.
- K = Kennicott, *Vet. Test. Heb. cum Variis Lectionibus*, 1776.

4 TEXT-CRITICAL APPARATUS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

- L = The Lucianic recension of \mathfrak{E} , represented by codd. 19, 93*a*, 108*b*; ed. Lagarde, *Lib. Vet. Test. Can. Graece*, 1883. (Codd. 93 and 108 contain two recensions of Esther: 93*a* and 108*b* that of L; and 93*b* and 108*a* that of O.)
- \mathfrak{L} = The old Latin version (Itala), according to Codex Corbeiensis; ed. Sabatier, *Bib. Sac. Lat. Vers. Ant.*, 1751.
- \mathfrak{L}^P = Old Latin, Codex Pechianus, according to Sabatier.
- M = J. H. Michaelis, *Biblia Hebraica*, 1720.
- \mathfrak{M} = The Massoretic Hebrew text.
- N = Codex Basiliano-Vaticanus (= XI, according to Holmes and Parsons).
- N¹ = The Hagiographa, Naples 1486–87, according to Ginsburg.
- N² = Hebrew Bible, Naples 1491–93, according to Ginsburg.
- O = The Origenic recension of \mathfrak{E} , represented in general by codd. 52, 55, 64, 93*b*, 108*a*, 243, 249, according to Holmes and Parsons, and Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 1875.
- Oc = Occidental MSS or Massoretic authorities.
- Or = Oriental MSS or Massoretic authorities.
- Q = The *Qêrê*, or marginal readings of \mathfrak{M} .
- R = De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Vet. Test.*, 1786.
- S = Hebrew Bible, Soncino, 1488, according to Ginsburg.
- \mathfrak{S} = The Syriac version.
- \mathfrak{S}^A = The Syriac version in Codex Ambrosianus.
- \mathfrak{S}^L = The Syriac version in the London Polyglot.
- \mathfrak{S}^M = The Syriac version in the Mosul edition.
- \mathfrak{S}^U = The Syriac version in the Urumia edition.
- \mathfrak{T}^1 = The First Targum.
- \mathfrak{T}^2 = The Second Targum.

The readings of the cursives are all taken from Holmes and Parsons. They are as follows:

- 19 = Rome, Chigi R vi. 38 (cf. Bianchini, *Vindiciae*, 279 ff.; 19 = Lagarde's *h*).
- 44 = Zittau, A 1. 1 = Lagarde's *z* (cf. *Gen. Gr.* 7 ff.).
- 52 = Florence, Laur. Acq. 44.
- 55 = Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 1 (cf. Klostermann, *Analecta*, 12).
- 64 = Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 2 (cf. Field, i. 5).
- 68 = Venice, St. Mark's, Gr. 5 (cf. Scrivener-Miller, i. 219).
- 71 = Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 1.
- 74 = Florence, Laur. Acq. 700 (49).

- 76 = Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4.
 93 = London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2 (93a = Lagarde's *m*).
 106 = Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 187 (cf. Lagarde, *Ankündigung*, 27).
 107 = Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 188.
 108 = Rome, Vat. Gr. 330 (cf. Field i. 5; 108b = Lagarde's *d*).
 120 = Venice, St. Mark's Gr. 4.
 236 = Rome, Vat. Gr. 331 (cf. Klostermann, *Analecta*, 78).
 243 = Venice, St. Mark's Gr., 16 (cf. Field, i. 486).
 248 = Rome, Vat. Gr. 346 (cf. Nestle, *Marginalia*, p. 58).
 249 = Rome, Vat. Pius 1 (cf. Field ii. 2).

Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Gothic, and Syro-Hexaplar do not exist for Esther, and the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Arabic secondary versions are not accessible in printed editions. The text of the Armenian version of **Ⲅ** is so corrupt that it did not seem worth while to secure its variants from one familiar with Armenian.

My method has been to take the *Textus Receptus* of Van der Hooght (1705) as the standard of comparison, and to record deviations from it in MSS, editions, or versions. Variations of accentuation in the Hebrew, which do not affect the interpretation, and which for the most part represent only the notions of particular punctuators or schools of punctuators, such as Baer's מִרְדְּכִי for מִרְדְּכִי, וַיַּעֲבֹר for וַיַּעֲבֹר, וַיַּבְבֵּק for וַיַּבְבֵּק, or Ginsburg's insertion of *Raphe* over all quiescent or aspirate letters, it has not seemed worth while to include. In the case of the long passages that are found in **ⲄⲚⲗ**, but not in **Ⲛ**, I have taken Swete's edition of Codex Vaticanus as the standard of comparison. These passages I have inserted in full as additions to **Ⲛ**, and have recorded the variants in footnotes. Variants in the versions which represent the same Hebrew word I have not attempted to record; for instance, when **Ⲅ** renders מִשְׁחָה by *δοχην* and L by *πιστον*. To have recorded all the variants of this sort would have been useless and would have swelled this article to an enormous size.

Title אֶסְתֵּר **Ⲅ**: Αισθηρ 93a: + βιβλιον εικοστον δευτερον 44: + ητοι Φρουραι 108b later hand | Between the title and 1:1 **ⲄⲚⲗ** L add the section A 1-17 (= Vulg. and Eng. 11: 2-12:6).

ADDITION A

- 1 ΕΤΟΤΣ δευτέρου^a βασιλεύοντος Ἀρταξέρξου^b τοῦ μεγάλου βασι-
λέως^c τῇ^d μιᾷ τοῦ^e Νεισά^f ἐνύπνιον ἶδεν Μαρδοχαίος ὁ τοῦ Ἰαείρου^g
2 τοῦ Σεμείου^h τοῦ Κεισαίουⁱ ἐκ^j φυλῆς Βενιαμείν^k ἄνθρωπος^a Ἰου-
δαίος οἰκῶν^b ἐν Σούσοις^c τῇ πόλει,^d ἄνθρωπος μέγας,^e θεραπεύων^f ἐν
3 τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως. ἦν δὲ^a ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἧς^b ἡχμαλώ-
τευσεν Ναβουχοδοноσορ^c βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος ἐξ^d Ἱερουσαλήμ^e μετὰ^f
4 Ἱεχονίου τοῦ^g βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας.^h καὶ τοῦτο^a αὐτοῦ^b τὸ ἐνύπ-
μιον· καὶ ἰδοὺ φωναί^c καὶ^d θόρυβος,^e βρονταὶ καὶ^f σεισμός,^g τάραχος
5 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ ἰδοὺ^a δύο^b δράκοντες^c μέγαλοι^d ἔτοιμοι^e προῆλθον^f
6 ἀμφότεροι παλαίειν· καὶ ἐγένετο^g αὐτῶν^h φωνήⁱ μεγάλη,^j καὶ τῇ^a
φωνῇ αὐτῶν^b ἡτοιμάσθη πᾶν ἔθνος εἰς^c πόλεμον ὥστε^d πολεμῆσαι
7 δικαίων^e ἔθνος.^f καὶ^g ἰδοὺ^h ἡμέρα σκότους καὶ γνόφου,ⁱ θλίψις^j καὶ
8 στενοχωρία,^a κάκωσις^b καὶ^c τάραχος^d μέγας^e ἐπὶ^f τῆς^g γῆς.^h καὶ ἐτα-
ράχθη^a δίκαιον^b πᾶν ἔθνος,^c φοβούμενοι τὰ αὐτῶν κακά,^d καὶ ἡτοι-
9 μάσθησαν^e ἀπολέσθαι.^f καὶ ἐβόησαν^g πρὸς τὸν^h θεόν.ⁱ ἀπὸ δὲ^j τῆς
βοῆς^a αὐτῶν^b ἐγένετο ὥσανει^c ἀπὸ^d μικρᾶς πηγῆς^e ποταμὸς^f μέγας,
10 ὕδωρ πολὺ.^g φῶς^a καὶ^b ὁ^c ἥλιος ἀνέτειλεν, καὶ οἱ ταπεινοὶ^d ὑψώθη-

A: 1-17 93b has under + : C has in cap. xi-xii, Lib. Esth. Apocr.

1 a om 71 | b Ασσυριου L: Ασσυριου 19, 108b: Assuero B: Αρταξέρξου A | c om N A L 44, 52, 55, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 107, 120, 236, 243, 248, 249, C, Ald, Athan. ii, 98 | d om L | e + μηνος 44, 71, 106, 107: + μηνος Αδαρ L | f Νισα N* (-σαν N ?) A, 55: Νισαν L: Μισα (with corr. N) N: Νεισαν Athan. l. c.: + os εστι Δυστρος Ξανθικός L: qui est Andicus B | g Ιαρείου 236: Ιαρον 243, 248, C, Ald: Iarim B | h Σεμείου N A L and many cursives: Σεμαιου 19: Σεμει 248, 249, Athan. l. c.: Σεμει C: Σεμει B | i Κεισαίου L: Ησαιου 19: Κησαιου 93a: Εισαίου 108b: qui Cisaei B: om 44, 106, 107 | j της L: εκ της N c. a. A | k Βενιαμιν L

2 a-d om L B | 2a-3b B puts at end of chap. 3 | c μεσοις A* vid: μεσουσοις A | d φοβον-μενος τον θεον Ισραηλ 71 | 2-3a om L | e θεραπευτης ων 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald (pr kai 71)

3 tr aft 3: 15 B | b ην 74, 76 | c om 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120: + ο N c. a. N L 249, C, Ald | d-e om L | den N | f + του 93b | g om 44, 52, 248, C, Ald

4 a + ην L | b αυτο 93a. ipsius B | c φωνη L, 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald | d + κραυγη L | e θορυβου A L 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald: + και 74, 76 | f συσσεισμος 106: + και N c. a. A L, 44, 52, 64, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 243, 248 C, Ald

5 a om B | b om 103 | c + επι της γης 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | d om L | e και L: ετοιμως 52 | f προσηλθον A L 52 | g εγενοντο A N | h αυτω Ald | i φωναί A: rugna B | j μεγαλαιο A: + και εταρασ-στο παντα απο της φωνης της κραυγης ταυτης L

6 a-c om L | a-b om L | c-f om 106 | c-d om L | e δικαιον 52, 103a

7 a-b μαρτυρομενη πασι τοις λαοις L: et dominabantur B | c γνοφους A | d-f om L B | d θλιψεις 44 | e om A 93b: + και 52, 64, 93b, 243 Ald | g om A 52, 64, 243 Ald | h ταραχη πολεμου L: ταραχη και πολεμου 93a: et strepitus magnus in his qui sunt B | j-8f om L | k om 236

8 a εταραχησαν 64 | a-d om B | b-c παν εθνος δικαιον A | b δικαίων 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | e-f timuerunt in perditionem B | f απολεσαι 44, 93b, 106

9 a-c om B | a ανεβοσημαεν L: απεβοσημαεν 93a | b om L 44, 106, 249 | c κυριον L 249 | d-e φωνης της κραυγης L | e φωνης 236 | f + και L | g ως αν N: om A L: fons unius et B | h-i εκ πηγης μικρας L | j-k υδωρ πολν ποταμος μεγας L

10 a so N c. a. L: other codd και φως: φωτος N* | b om L B N* 93b, 249 | c om L B 52, 108a | d ποταμοι L: humiles B

σαν καὶ κατέφαγον^c τοὺς ἐνδόξους. ¹¹καὶ διεγερθεῖς^a Μαρδοχαῖος^b **11**
 ἑωρακὼς^c τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦτο,^d καὶ^e τί^f ὁ θεός^g βεβούλευται^h ποιῆσαι,
 εἶχενⁱ αὐτὸ^j ἐν τῇ^k καρδίᾳ,^l καὶ^m ἐν παντὶ λόγῳⁿ ἤθελεν^o ἐπιγινῶναι^p
 αὐτὸ^q ἕως τῆς^r νυκτός.^s ¹²καὶ^a ἡσύχασεν^b Μαρδοχαῖος^c ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ^d **12**
 μετὰ Γαβάθα^e καὶ Θαρρά^f τῶν δύο εὐνούχων τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν^g
 φυλασσόντων τὴν αὐλήν,^h ¹³ἡκουσέν^a τε^b αὐτῶν^c τοὺς λογισμοὺς^d καὶ^e **13**
 τὰς μερίμνας^f αὐτῶν ἐξηραύνησεν,^g καὶ ἔμαθεν^h ὅτιⁱ ἐτοιμάζουσιν^j
 τὰς^k χεῖρας^l ἐπιβαλεῖν^m Ἀρταξέρξηⁿ τῷ βασιλεῖ.^o καὶ^p ὑπέδειξεν^q
 τῷ^r βασιλεῖ^s περὶ^t αὐτῶν. ¹⁴καὶ ἐξήτασεν^a ὁ^b βασιλεὺς^c τοὺς δύο **14**
 εὐνούχους,^d καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες^e ἀπήχθησαν,^f ¹⁵καὶ ἔγραψεν^a ὁ βασι- **15**
 λεὺς τοὺς^b λόγους τούτους^c εἰς^d μνημόσυνον,^e καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος^f
 ἔγραψεν^g περὶ^h τῶν λόγων τούτων.ⁱ ¹⁶καὶ ἐπέταξεν^a ὁ βασιλεὺς **16**
 Μαρδοχαίῳ^b θεραπεύειν^c ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ,^d καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ^e δόματα^f περὶ
 τούτων.^g ¹⁷καὶ^a ἦν^b Ἀμὰν Ἀμαδάθου^c Βουγαῖος^d ἔνδοξος^e ἐνώπιον^f **17**
 τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐξήτησεν^g κακοποιῆσαι^h τὸν Μαρδοχαῖονⁱ καὶ^j τὸν
 λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ^k τῶν δύο^l εὐνούχων τοῦ^m βασιλέως.ⁿ

10 ^eκατεπιον L: comederent 𐤀

11 ^aαναστας L: εγερθεῖς N: διεγερθη, 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | ^b+ο 𐤁 and most codd | ^c-δεκ του υπνου αυτου L | ^d+εμεριμνα τι το ενυπνιον (+ αυτου 93a) L: +et dixit 𐤀: +και ελογισατο εν εαυτω 71, 74, 76, 106, 120 | ^eom 71, 74, 76, 106, 120 | ^fοτι 236: om Ald. | ^gευνωτος L | ^hβουλευεται A 243, 248, C: ετοιμαζει L: βουλεται 93b: βεβουλευεται 236 | ⁱ-και το ενυπνιον αυτου κεκρυμμενον ην L: et erat visum conjunctum 𐤀 | ^jτο ενυπνιον τουτο A | ^kom A | ^l+αυτου L 236 | ⁿκαιρω L | ^m-n om 93b 𐤀 | ^oηλθεν 93b: ηθελησεν A 236, 243, 248 C | ^p-p ην αναζητων L | ^rεπιγινωναι 𐤁* | ^rαυτου 𐤁: αυτω 52, 120 | ^s-q αυτο επιγινωναι A | ^t+επικρισις διασαφηθησεται αυτω L | ^tom A 74, 76 | ^uημερας L

12-17 om 𐤀 | **12** ^a-b ης υπνωσε L | ^b+και ελογισατο εν εαυτω τι ο θεος βεβουλευται ποιησαι το ενυπνιον τουτο 44 | ^cκαι ην 44: +ὁ εωρακως το ενυπνιον τουτο 106 | ^d+του βασιλεως L: ὁ Ασταου L: Ασταγου 93a: Γαββαθα 93b: Βαθα 120: fΘαρα 𐤁*: Θεδεντου L: Θευδεντου 19: Θαρας 93b | ^g-h om L | ^hτην πυλην 93b

13 ^a-b και ηκουσε L | ^bδε 𐤁 c. a: γαρ A | ^c-d τους λογισμους αυτων A: τους λογους αυτων L | ^e-g om 44, 106 | ^fδιαβολας L: καρδιας 249 | ^g-h om L | ⁱως L | ^jεξηγουντο L | ^k-m του επιθεσθαι L | ^l+αυτων 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | ⁿΑσσυηρω L | ^o+του ανελιν αυτον εν δε φρονησας ο Μαρδοχαιος L | ^pom L | ^qαπηγγειλε L | ^r-s om L | ^s+Μαρδοχαιος 44, 76, 106, 120, 236: +Μαρδουχαιος 74: +αυτω Μαρδοχαιος 71 | ^tυπερ 93b

14 ^aητασεν L 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: εξεταξεν 52: εξητασεν (σ over eras.) A^a | ^b-om 52 | ^d+και ευρε τους λογους Μαρδοχαίου L: +αυτου 52, 243 C, Ald | ^e+οι ευνωχοι L | ^fεξηχθησαν 𐤁*c. b A: απηχθησαν C

15 ^a+Ασσυηρος L (Ασσυηρω 93a | ^b-c περι των λογων τουτων L | ^d-o om L | ^e+ομοιως 44, 106 | ^f-g εγραφη Μαρδοχαίος L | ^g+εν τω βιβλῳ του βασιλεως L | ^g-i om in space 44, 106 | ^h+του μνημορευειν L | ⁱom 248 C

16 ^aενετελατο L | ^bπερι του Μαρδοχαίου L: Μαρδοχαίον 248 C | ^c+αυτον L | ^d+του βασιλεως και πασαν θυραν επιφανως ηθρειν L | ^eΜαρδοχαίω 𐤁 c. a ms A 93b | ^fom L | ^gαυτων 𐤁 c. a A: τουτου N 44, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 103a, 120, 243, C, Ald: τουτο 52

17 ^a-b om L | ^cΑμαναδαθον B*: Ναμαναδαθον B^b (ph): Αμαθαδον A 74, 106, 248 (so always): Αμαλαθον 55: Αμαδαθον 93b | ^dτω Βουγαίος 93b: Μακεδονα L | ^e-f κατα προσωπον (προσωπω 93a) L | ^gεζητει ο Αμάν L | ^j+παντα L | ^k+του λελαληκεναι αυτον τω βασιλει περι L | ^lom L: after ευνωχων Ald. | ^m-n δι οτι ανηρεθησαν L

CHAPTER I

- I, 1 [יְהִי] και εξηγησε 108a: om 44 3: +μετα τους λογους τουτους 6 L (93b under +: 44, 108a, C om) | בִּינִי | και εκρατησεν 108a: om 44 | אֶהְיֶה שׁוֹרֵשׁ 1] Assueri 3: Artaxerxis 3: אֶסְמִיךָ S: Ασσηρον L: Αρταξερξου 6 (so 3 S L 6 elsewhere): om 44, 108a | הָיָה om K 151, R 899 3: הָיָה S: ουτος δε 44: του βασιλεως L | אֶהְיֶה שׁוֹרֵשׁ 2] om K 151, R 899 3: του μεγαλου L: + ο βασιλευων 93b under * | הַמֶּלֶךְ om 106 | בְּהַדְרֹו + χωρας 106 | וְעַד כֹּשׁ so L 3 N^{a, omg}, 93b under *: om 6 | שִׁבְעַ | pr super 3: om S | וְעֶשְׂרִים pr 6 S

2 [בִּימֵי הָהֵם] om 3 3 L | [הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶהְיֶה שׁוֹרֵשׁ] om A * 3 N 55, 108a | [הַמֶּלֶךְ] om L | מַלְכוּתוֹ — עַל om 6 (93b has under *) | אֲשֶׁר om 3 6 3 L | [בְּשׁוֹשַׁן הַבִּירָה] om L 3

3 om 3 | [בְּשַׁנַּת שְׁלוֹשׁ] om L | [και ο βασιλευς L | Μισσητα] + grande 3 S 44, 74, 76, 120, 236 | [לְכָל] so 93b: om 6 L | [שָׂרִיר] τοις φιλοις 6: τοις δουλοις 236: τοις αρχουσιν L: τοις φιλοις αυτου 44, 71, 74, 76, 120 | [וְעַבְדֵּיו] και τοις λοιποις εθνεσιν 6: om L | [וּמְדִי — הִיל] om S^U (S^{ALM} have) | [וְהִל] και τοις ενδοξοις 6: της αυλης (הִיכָל) L: pr וְשָׂרִיר conj Buhl | [פָּרַס] some codd incorrectly | [הַפְּרָחִים] και τοις αρχουσιν 6: και οι αρχοντες L | [וְשָׂרִיר] των σατραπων 6: om L | [הַמְּדִינֹת] S: om 6 | [לְפָנָיו] και μετα ταυτα 6 (93b under +): + סִכּוֹסֶבֶל וְסִכְמֶבֶל S

4 om 3 | [בְּהִרְאָתוֹ] μετα το δεξει αυτοις G: εις το επιδειχθηναι L: εδειξεν αυτοις 44, 71, 76, 106, 120, 236 | [כְּבֹד] S: om 6 (93b has under *) | [מַלְכוּתוֹ] του βασιλεως L | [יָקָר] so Mas (Baer): יָקָר var G C (see Norzi ad loc.): aft. גְּדוּלָּתוֹ 3 | וְאֵת יָקָר — גְּדוּלָּתוֹ om 44, 106 | [גְּדוּלָּתוֹ] so many edd: גְּדוּלָּתוֹ B¹ C Ba G: om L 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald | יָמִים | רַבִּים om 6 L | [שְׁמוֹנִים] pr εν B pr επι N L N, 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 248, Ald, 55, 108a | [וּמֵאֶחַת] om 70

5 [וּבְמִלּוֹאֹת] Q: om 19 3 | [הַיָּמִים] om 19 3 | [הָאֵלֶּה] 6 S L: του γαμου 6 (ποτου A N^{a, omg}, 93b under —: + αυτου 93b): om 3: convivii 3 | [הַמֶּלֶךְ] om 3 3 44, 106 | [לְכָל] om 3 | [הָעַם] om L 3 | [בְּשׁוֹשַׁן] eis 6 (εν 44, 93b, 106): [הַבִּירָה] Thebani 3: om 3 | [לְמִגְדוֹל] — קֶטֶן om 6: to end of vs om 3 | [שִׁבְעַת] 6 6 | [גִּנָּת] om 6 L | [בֵּיתָן] om 3: + συμφοιτου 93b under *: et nemoris 3: om 3 | [הַמֶּלֶךְ] quod regio cultu et manu consitum erat 3: + αγων τα σωτηρια αυτου. ην δε εξεστρωμενα L: + κεκοσμημενη 6: + και ην η αυλη κεκοσμημενη 44, 71, 74, 76, 120, 236: και ην κεκοσμημενη 106: + erant autem strata stragula regis derpina 3: + et pendebant ex omne parte tentoria 3: + סִכְמֶבֶל וְסִכּוֹסֶבֶל S

6 [הָרִי] large, so Mas: aerii coloris 3: [כֶּבֶד] S: βυσσινους 6 | [כֹּבֶס] S: om 44, 106: καρπασινους 6: | [וְחִתְכֶּלֶת] om 6: + και κοκκινα εμπλεγμανα εν ανθεσιν και σκηνη L: + et super organa 3 | [אַחַד] pl. 6 S | [אֶחָד] — בּוֹץ om 44, 106, 71 | [וְאֶרְגָּמָן] om 71: om 7 44, 106 | [גְּלִילִי]

κυβοῖς Ɔ L: om 71 𐤀: + χρυσοῖς καὶ Ɔ [כסף] eburneis Ɔ: om 𐤀 | [יעבורי] Ɔ
 στύλοις Ɔ: καὶ στύλοις L: [כסף] 𐤀 S: columna 𐤀: om 71 | [שש] eparina
 (electa) 𐤀: + καὶ λιθινοῖς Ɔ: + περιχρυσοῖς L: + fulciebantur Ɔ: [כסף] 𐤀
 S: om 71 | [משוח] pr καὶ L 𐤀 S | [וכסף] om L: + [כסף] 𐤀 | [בהט] om
 𐤀 S | [ושש] om L 71, 106: tr w next Ɔ | [ודר וסחרת] et pictura varia
 𐤀: [כסף] 𐤀 S: quod mira varietate pictura decorebat Ɔ:
 καὶ πιννινον . . . καὶ στρωμναι διαφανεις ποικιλως διηγητισμεναι κυκλω ροδα
 πεπασμενα Ɔ: καὶ κυκλω ροδα L

7 [והשקות] bibebant autem qui invitati erant Ɔ: to שונים om 𐤀 |
 [זהב] + καὶ ἀργυρα καὶ ἀνθρακινον κυλικιον προκειμενον απο ταλαντων τρισμυ-
 ριων G | [שונים—וכלים] om Ɔ: ἐξάλλα L: et aliis atque aliis vasis cibi
 inferebantur Ɔ | [ויין] om 𐤀 Ɔ | [מלכות] om Ɔ 𐤀: praecipuum Ɔ | רב
 so Mas on II Chron 28: 8 (cf. Dan 11: 3): om L: + καὶ ἡδὺς Ɔ: + et
 suave valde 𐤀 | [כיר] on αὐτος ἐπινεν Ɔ 𐤀: on πινει L

8 [והשתיה] et ad jucunditatem bibere 𐤀: ponebantur Ɔ | [כדת]
 pr ou Ɔ: om 𐤀 | [אין אנס] om Ɔ L | [יסד] ἠθελησεν . . . καὶ ἐπεταξεν Ɔ |
 [הבליך] om 𐤀 | [על] praeponeus mensis singulos Ɔ | [כל רב ביתו] τοῖς
 οἰκονομοῖς Ɔ: actoribus domui 𐤀: de principibus suis Ɔ: om L | [כרצון]
 + αὐτου καὶ Ɔ

9 [גם] om S | [ושתי] Ἀστιν Ɔ: Ἀστι C: αὕτη 55: Οὐασθειν 93b: Οὐαστιν
 L: Vasthi 𐤀 𐤀 (so subsequently in all these recensions) | [משחה] +
 μεγαλην πασαις L S: magnum 𐤀 | [בית] pr en Ɔ L 𐤀 S | [המלכות] βασι-
 λειοῖς Ɔ: του βασιλεως L | [אשר למליך] om L 𐤀: οπου ο βασιλευς Ɔ |
 [אהשורוש] om L

10 [ביום] pr εγενετο δε L: pr itaque Ɔ: pr o S | [לב] om Ɔ L 𐤀 | [ביין]
 om Ɔ 𐤀: et post nimiam potationem incaluisset mero Ɔ | [אמר] + o βα-
 σιλευς L | [למהומן] τω Ἀμαν Ɔ: Maosma (Maosinan) 𐤀: Μαουμαν 93b:
 Ἀζαν 249: Mauman Ɔ: [כסף] S: καὶ Μαζαν Ɔ (Βαζαν 𐤀: Βαζα A: Ιαζαν 64: Ἀμαν
 249: Βαζαθα C: Ζαβαθα 93b: Ζαβα(v) 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: Nabattha
 (Abathan) 𐤀: om L | [הרבוניה] et (H)arbona Ɔ: [כסף] S: καὶ
 Θαρρα Ɔ (Ἀρβωνα 93b: Χαρβωνα C): et (N)arbona 𐤀: om L | [בגתא] et
 Bagatha Ɔ: [כסף] S: καὶ Βωραζη Ɔ (Βαγαθα 93b C): et Thares (Tharas)
 𐤀: om L | [ואבחנתא] [כסף] S: καὶ Αβταζα Ɔ (Αβγαθα 93a):
 Achedes (Cedes) 𐤀: om L | [זתה] et Zethar Ɔ: et Zathi (Azatai) L: [כסף]
 S: καὶ Ζαθολθα Ɔ (Ζηθαθαθα A: Ζαθολα 249: Ζαραθ 93b: Ζηθα C: Ζαθολθα
 71: Ζαθολα(v) 44, 106): om L | [וכרכס] S: καὶ Θαραβα Ɔ (Θα-
 βαζ A: Βαρσαβα 249: Αχαρβας 93b: Χαραβας C: Αθαβαβα 41, 71, 106):
 T'(h)arecta 𐤀: om L | [שבעת חסריסים] om L | [המשרתים] om 52, 64,
 243, 248, C, Ald | [את פני] om Ɔ L: τοῖς πρωτοις 71 | [הבליך] ejus Ɔ: αὐτου
 L 44, 106 | [אהשורוש] om 𐤀 L N 44, 55, 74, 76, 106, 108a, 120, 236

10 TEXT-CRITICAL APPARATUS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

11 אֶת וְשָׂרִי | om G L | לִפְנֵי — בִּלְכוֹת | προς αυτον βασιλευειν αυτην
 και περιθειναι αυτη το διαδημα G L: εις το συνεστηκος συμποσιον εν τω διαδηματι
 της βασιλευας αυτης L: coram rege posito super caput ejus diademate J |
 [לְהַרְאוֹת] + πασιν N A N 44, 55, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 108a, 120, 243, 248, 249,
 L J: κατα προσωπον L | [הַעֲמִים] της στρατιας αυτου L | [הָיָא — וְהַשְׂרִים]
 om L

12 [הַמְלִיכָה] om J L | [וְשָׂרִי] om J L 44, 106 | [לְבוֹא] ποιησαι L |
 [אֲשֶׁר — בְּדִבְרֵי] om G L | [אֲשֶׁר] om L: + mandaverat J: + حَمِي |
 S | [בִּיד הַסְּרִיסִים] μετα των ευνουχων G: cum eis L: om 44, 106: + ως
 δε ηκουσεν ο βασιλευς οτι ηκυρωσεν Ουαστιν την βουλην αυτου L | [הַמְלִיךְ] om
 L | [מֵאֵד] om G

13 [הַמְלִיךְ] om G: + πασι L | [לְחַכְמַיִם] τοις φιλοις αυτου G L: + حَكَم |
 S | [יְדַעִי הַעֲתִים] om G L J | [יְדַעִי — הַעֲתִים] om L | [כִּי] κατα
 ταυτα G: qui ex J | [דְּבַר] more J: ελαλησεν G | [הַמְלִיךְ] Αστιν G: +
 [אֶחָד] S | [לִפְנֵי] semper ei aderant J: et dixit rex L: ποιησατε ουν
 G | [כֹּל] et illorum faciebat cuncta consilio J: περι G: omnibus L |
 [יְדַעִי] τουτου G: principibus L

14 [וְהַקְרִב] pr primi J: pr حَق S: και προσηλθεν (θον) G L | [אֱלִי] om J | [כִּרְשֵׁנָא] Charsena J: حَرْشَن S^{LU}: Αρκεσαιος G (Χαρσαν
 93b: Mardochaeus L: om L | [שֶׁתָּר] so N¹ S N² Br C B¹ B² G: שֶׁתָּר
 Ba: Sethar J: شَثَر S: Σαρσθαβιος G (Σαρεσθεος A: Σαραθαβιος 249: Ασθα
 93b): Soratha (Soratheas) L: om L | [אֲדַמְתָּא] Admatha J: ادمثا S:
 Μαλησεαρ G: Παμαθα 93b: Malesar (Malesath) L: om L | [חַרְשִׁישׁ] Tharsis J:
 Tharsis J: حَرْشِش S: Παταλεως L: om G L | [מָרִיס] Mares J: مَرِيس S:
 S (S^A): Eas L: om G L | [מָרְסָנָא] Marsana J: مَرْسَن S: om
 G L L | [מִמּוּחָן] Mamuchan J: مُمُحَن S: Muchaeas L: om G L |
 [שִׁבְעָה] om S G L L | [רָאִי] tr with הישבים S: οι εγγυς G: και οι ορωντες L:
 qui proximi L | [הַיִּשְׁבִּים] pr και L | [רָאשֵׁנָה] S: om L L | [בְּמִלְכוֹת]
 post eum J: τω βασιλει G: + και απηγγειλαν αυτω G: om L

15 [וְשָׂרִי] om J L | [הַמְלִיךְ — מֵהָ] tr to vs 13 after וְדִין L | [כִּת] om
 L L | [לֹא עֲשֵׂתָה] μη τελεθηναι αυτην ποιησαι L | [אֲחֶשְׁוֹרֶשׁ] om G L L:
 + حَمِي S: + dicta erunt L | [בִּיד הַסְּרִיסִים] om L

16 [מִמּוּחָן] Q (cf vs 14): Mamuchan J: مُمُحَن S: Μουχαιος
 G: Βουγαιος L: Μιχέως (Mardochaeus) L | [הַמְלִיךְ] αυτον L: + حَمِي S:
 S | [וְהַשְׂרִים] + και τους ηγουμενους του βασιλευς 44, 106: και παντας τους
 αρχοντας 64: και προς τους αρχοντας 248, C, Ald: λεγων L | [לְבָדוֹ] om 64 |
 [עוֹתָה] عَظ S: ητιμασεν A | [וְשָׂרִי] om 44, 106 | [כֹּל] om L L | [כֹּל] ועל כל
 [הָעַמִּים] και τους ηγουμενους G: Περσων και Μηδων L: om 44, 106: et gentes
 L | [אֲשֶׁר — בְּדִינָתָהּ] om L G L | [הַמְלִיךְ] om L L | [אֲחֶשְׁוֹרֶשׁ] om L G

17 [כִּי] S: και γαρ G: και L | [יֵצֵא] S | [דְּבַר הַמְּלִיכָה] η
 αδικια αυτης L: eo contumelia regis L | [עַל כָּל הַנָּשִׁים] S: + حَمِي S:

22 om L | וישלח + o βασιλευς A su^{c. a mg}, 93b und. *, 1 | ספרים om
 G | מדינות המלך | provincias regni sui 1: την βασιλειαν G: regno suo
 1 | ומדינה | so A: om G S: gens 1 | ככתבה | κατα την λεξιν αυτων G: se-
 cundum interpretationes eorum 1: audire et legere poterat 1: + κατα
 το γραμμα αυτης 93b under * | ראל | כלשונו — ראל | so 93b under *: om G 1:
 diversis linguis et litteris 1 | להיות | בביתו — להיות | esse viros principes ac
 majores in domibus suis 1: ωστε ειναι φοβον αυτοις εν ταις οικiais αυτων G:
 ut esset unusquisque in domum suam 1 | עבו — ומדבר | so 93b under *: om G:
 et fuit timor magnus in omni muliere 1: et hoc per cunctos
 populos divulgari 1 | כלשונו | כל-שונה conj. Buhl

CHAPTER II

II, 1 אָהֶר — אֶהְיִירֹשׁ om L | אָהֶר | και μετα G | כִּשְׁךְ | εκοπασεν G | אֶהְיִירֹשׁ so A^{c.a.ms}, 93b under *: om G L | זָכָר | και ουκετι εμνησθη G (και ουκετι under ÷ 93b) εμνησθη γαρ A: και ουτως εστι του μνημονευειν L: to end of vs om L | וְשָׁחִי | cf. 1:9: + | שָׁחִי S: + μνημονευων G | וְאֵת | om י G: | כֹּלֵךְ S | עֲשָׂתָה | ελαλησεν G: | עֲפִיִשְׁעָה A L | וְאֵת — עֲלֶיהָ — και ως κατεκρινεν αυτην G: | Ασσυηρω τω βασιλει L: | οσα αυτη κατεκριθη A | וְאֵת | כֹּלֵךְ S

2 וְיִאֲמְרוּ + אֶל S | הַמֶּלֶךְ | προς τον βασιλεα A: ejus L | מִשְׁרָחִי | pr c S: om G L L (93b has under *) | יִבְקְשׁוּ | ζητηθητω G: quærantur L: | ζητησωμεν L | לְמֶלֶךְ נִדְרֹחַ | om L L | בְּתוֹלָת | so C: | בְּחֹלֹת Ba G: | αφθορα G

3 וְיִפְקֹד — טוֹבָת | om L L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | om J | פְּקִידִים | om J S | מִלְכוּתוֹ | om J S: om י A | וְיִקְבְּצוּ | επιδειξατωσαν A | אֵת כָּל | om G J | מִרְאָה — [הַנְּשִׁים] om L: et adducant eas ad civitatem Susan et tradant eas in domum feminarum J: et perducantur in Susis Thebari in conspectu mulierum L | אֵל — הַבִּירָה | om S | אֶל יָד | S: και παραδοθητωσαν G: et tradentur L: και δοθητωσαν προσταεισθαι υπο χειρα L | אֵל | על Or mss | הַנָּהָ | so S N² Br C B¹ G Ba: הַנָּהָ N¹ B² M Norzi: Egei J: | S: om G (vs. 8 Gal): Γωγαιον L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | qui est propositus et J: om S L | [הַנְּשִׁים] + regiarum J | וְנִתְּחַן | S: om L: + avrais 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | הַמִּרְקִיקָהָ | so Norzi, Mich. N² B² G: תְּמִרוּקִיקָהָ N¹ S Br C B¹ Ba: om L: + και η λοιπη επιμελεια G: + et cetera ad usus necessaria J

4 וְיִיטֵב — הַמֶּלֶךְ | om L | וְיַעַשׂ | ετοιμως L | כֵּן | + ut suggesserant J

5 אִישׁ | pr και G L S | יִהְיֶה | om L | הַבִּירָה | Thebari L | מִרְדְּכָי | so B² everywhere exc 4:12, see Norzi: מִרְדְּכָי Baer everywhere: מִרְדְּכָי Ginsburg everywhere: Μαρδοχαιος G L: | קִישׁ — בֶּן | cf. A:1 | אִישׁ | de stirpe J: | מַחֲבָ | S: εκ φυλης G: της φυλης L | יִמִּינִי | Jemini J: Βενιαμεν(μν) G L S

6 om L | אֲשֶׁר הִגְלָה | ex captivitate L | עִם הַגְּלָה | de captivitate L: eo tempore J: om G (93b has under *) | וְיִהְיֶה — אֲשֶׁר | om G L (93b has under *) | הִגְלָתָהּ | om J | אֲשֶׁר | om J | נִבְּרַחְנָה | Ναβουχοδονοσορ G L

7 אֶמֶן — הַדָּסָה | τουτω παις θρεπτη G: εκτρεφων πιστως L: illi L | הָיָה אֶסְתֵּר | so 93b under *: και ονομα αυτη Εσθηρ G: την Εσθηρ L: tr to end of vs (Hester) L: quae altero nomine vocabatur Esther J | בֶּת דָּדוֹ | θυγατηρ Αμνιουδβ (Αμνιουδβ A) αδελφου πατρος αυτου G: filia fratris ejus et nutrierat eam Mardochaeus sicuti adoptatam filiam L: filiae fratris sui J | כִּי — וְאֵם | om G L: L has | תָּאָר | + σφοδρα A^{c.a.ms} L: + nimis L | לָבֶת — וּבְנִיּוֹת | so L A^{c.a.ms}, 93b under *: om G L | מִרְדְּכָי | so L | מִרְדְּכָי | so A^{c.a.ms}, 93b under *: om G | לָבֶת | eis γυναικα G (eis θυγατερα 93b)

9 [בְּעֵינָיו] + υπερ πασας [הַנְּעָרָה] om L | [וְתִשָּׁב] + et
[לפניו] + και ελεον L | [ותשא] + Εοθηρ L | [חֶסֶד] + mundum muliebrem B: 𐤇𐤍𐤊𐤌𐤃𐤓
S: το σμηγμα G: προστατῆσαι αὐτης L: ad omnes nitores ejus L | [ואת]
[מנותה] so B² Ba: ואת מנותיה G: om L | S 𐤅𐤏𐤔 | [וראיות] + σ [הַנְּעִירֹת] om L | [τας
αβρας] om L | [לחת²] om B G L | [לה] om B L | [מיבות] — [הַנְּשִׂים] om L |
[הַמִּלֵּךְ] ejusdem L | [וישנה] et tam ipsam ornaret B: 𐤈𐤕𐤓 S: και εξη-
στατο αυτη G | [ונערותיה] — [ישנה] om L | [לשוב -- הנשים] atque excolet-
et B: καλως εν τω γυναικωνι G (+ eis αγαθον 93b under *): aetatis ipsius
in conventu mulierum L

11 om L | רובכל | om ו ו (A 93b have) | מרדכי | *qui* א | לפני |
R 2 | בית | om ש | הנשים | *in qua electae virgines servabantur* א | את |
שלוש | ש | *τι συμβησεται* א | אסתר | + *et scire volens* א | ei א |
ומה — בנה — om א | בנה | some codd (R)

13 om L | [ובזה] om א | [הנערה] codd הנער, הנערה Q: om א ב ג ד
(93b has under *) | את — [המלך] om ז | כל | [את] καὶ ט | [תאמיר] + *ad*
ornatum pertinens א | [לה] + *et ut eis placuerat compositae* א | לבוא
עמה | *transibant* א

14 בערב — באה et cum introiret mulier ad domum regis L:
tr to vs 16 L | ובבקר היא שבה ad diem unum et recurrebat L: tr to
vs 16 L | שבה + atque inde deducebatur J | אל בית om L |

הנשים] om 3 | שני *Sēbhîr*: מְשִׁנָּה conj Buhl: om 5 | אל] Var Or: pr quae 3 | אל — [הפילגשים] om 11 | אל יד] of 6 | שְׁעִשְׁגָז] some codd, S B': שְׁעִשְׁגָז C Ba G: *Susagazi* 3: سسغز S: Γαι 6 (*Σασαγάζ* 93b) | [המלך] om 3 44, 106 | [הפילגשים] + *regis* 3 | [לא תבוא] pr και 6 S: *non habebat spado potestatem inducendi* 11 | [המלך — עוד] om 11 | כי] *ως δε* L | [הפך — הפך] κατεμανθανεν ο βασιλευς L: om 6 11 (93b has under *) | [ונקראה בשם] om 7 6 L: πασας τας παρθενους L | + *evoluto autem tempore per ordinem* 3

15 [ובהגיע תר] *εφανη επιφανεστατη* L: + *introeundi* 11 | בת — end of vs om L | [אביהיל] so 11: *Abihail* 3: ابيحيل S^A: ابيحيل S^{LM}: ابيحيل S^U: *Abihel (Chihel)* 11: Αμειναδαβ 6 (*Αβιχαλ* C) | [דר] *fratris* 3 11 | [לבת — אשר] om 6 11 (93b has under *) | [לבוא] εν τω εισελθειν A: pr ον εμελλεν 44: *introibat* 11 | [המלך] + *et factum est cum introiret ad regem* 11 | [דבר] *muliebrem cultum* 3 | [אח — כי] om 6 11 | [אשר] ων 6: ων αυτη N A N 55, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 108a, 243, 248, 249, C, Ald: εκ παντων ων αυτη 44: *ex quibus* 11 | [הגרי] om 6 11 (93b has under *) | [המלך] om 3 S 6 11 (93b has under *) | [שמיר הנשים] om 11 106: + *haec ei ad ornatum dedit erat enim formosa valde et incredibili pulchritudine* 3 | [ותהי אסתר] om 3 | [הך] + *et amabilis* 3

16 [אחשורוש] om 93b 3 | [אסתר] om 11 | [המלך] — ותלקה 16 | [מלכותו — אל] to end of vs] om L | [אל בית] om L 11 44, 106 | [העשירי] τω δωδεκατω 6 11 (*δεκατω* 93b C) | [הוא הדש] om 11 | [טבת — טבת] Ba: طبت S: Αδap 6 11: Αδερ 248 (so always): Τηβηθ N^{C.A}: Βηθ 93b

17 [אסתר — ויאהב] ηρεσεν αυτω σφοδρα L (tr aft 2:9) | [אסתר] + 1 S: αυτης 44, 76, 106 | [מכל הנשים] om 6 L 11 (93b has under *) | [והסד] om 5 6 11 (93b has under *) | [לפניו] om 6 (93b has under *) | [מכל הבתולות] *super omnes mulieres* 3: om L | [וישם] S | [וימליכה] αυτη 6 11 | [בראשה] om 11 | [ושתי — וימליכה] om 6 L: 11 has, and 93b under *

18 [ועבדו] om L | [המלך] om 3 | [גדול] om 6 11 (93b has under *) | [ועבדו] S: και ταις δυναμεσιν + επι ημερας επτα και νψωσεν 6: + και ηγαγεν ο βασιλευς L | [משתה] *pro conjunctione et nuptiis* 3: τους γαμους 6 11: τον γαμον L | [אסתר] + επιφανως L | [למדינות] τοις υπο την βασιλειαν αυτου 6: pr πασαις L 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 11 3 | [המלך — ויתן] om 6 L 11

19 om L | [שניה — ובהקבץ] om 6 11 (93b has under *): + *et congregarentur* 3: + وجمع S | [ומרדכי] om 7 S | [ישב] here only in book written defectively, 11: εθεραπευεν 6: *sedebat* 11 | [המלך] om 6 (93b has under *)

20 om L | ואת עמה, om G (exc 93b *) | מרדכי + φοβεσθαι τον θεον G (under ÷ 93b): + et timeret Deum omni die L | ואת ut L | במאמר omnia L | מרדכי ille J: αυτου G: om L | אסתר om G L | עשה ποιειν G: servaret L | באמינה om G L (exc 93b *) | אתו + και Εσθηρ ου μετηλλαξεν την αγωγην αυτης G (93b under ÷)

21 om L | בימים — המלך om G: εως της νυκτος και ησυχασεν Μαρδοχαιος εν τη αυλη G (A:11f.): εως της ημερας ης υπνωσε Μαρδοχαιος εν τη αυλη του βασιλεως L (A:11) | בימים pr o S | ומרדכי om r S | קצה pr και G S: om L: μετα G (A:12) L (A:12) | בַּגָּתָן Bagathan J: ܒܓܬܐ S: om G (A:12 Γαβαθα): Ασταου L (A:12): Γαββαθαν 93b*: Βαταθαν 249: Βαγαθως Jos xi § 207 w var: Βαγαθαν N^{c. a mg sup}: Bartageus (Bastageus) L | ותרש et Thares J: ܐܬܪܫ S: om G (A:12 και Θαρρα): και Θεδευτον L (A:12): και Θαρας 93b*: και Θαρρα 249: και Θεοδεστος Jos xi § 207 w var: Thedestes L | המלך + qui janitores erant et in primo palatii J | והקה την αυλην G (A:13): atrium L: + οτι προηχθη Μαρδοχαιος G (93b under ÷): + ηκουσεν τε αυτων τους λογισμους και τας μεριμνας αυτων εξηραυνησεν και εμαθεν G (A:13): + και ηκουσε τους λογους αυτων και τας διαβολας αυτων L (A:13) | ויבקשו ויבקשו Ba | לשלח יד αποκτειναι G L | אהשוורש so Oc: אהשוורש Or: om 44, 106 L: + του ανελειν αυτον L (A:13): + et occidere eum J

22 om L | ויודע — למרדכי και υπεδειξεν τω βασιλει περι αυτων G (A:13): εν δε φρονησας ο Μαρδοχαιος απηγγειλε περι αυτων L (A:13) | ויגד + αυτον 248 C: + Mardochaeus L | מרדכי — ויגד om G in A:13, L in A:13 | המלכה om G L (exc 93b *) | ותאמר ותאמר J | אסתר αυτη G: η βασιλισσα A: illa J | למלך + Αρταξερξη N^{c. a mg} A, 93b ÷ | בשם מרדכי τα της επιβουλης G: et nomen Mardochaei L: + qui ad se rem detulerat J

23 om L | ויבקה — וימצא om 44, 106 | ויבקה + ο βασιλευς G | הדבר τους δυο ευνουχας G | וימצא και ευρε τους λογους Μαρδοχαιου L (A:14): et invenit sic L: om G: + και ομολογησαντες G (A:14), L (A:14): + και ομολογησαντες οι ευνουχοι L (A:14) | ויתלו απηχθησαν G (A:14), L (A:14) | על עץ om G L | ויכתב mandatum est historiis et traditum J: ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ S: και προσεταξεν ο βασιλευς καταχωρισαι εις μνημοσυνον G: και εγραψεν ο βασιλευς εις μνημοσυνον G (A:14): και εγραψεν Ασσηνρος ο βασιλευς L (A:14): et scriptum est memoriale L | המלך — בספר εν τη βασιλικη βιβλιοθηκη G: τους λογους τουτους G (A:15): περι των λογων τουτων L (A:15): legis L: + υπερ της ευνοιας Μαρδοχαιου εν εγκωμω G: + και επεταξεν (ενετειλατο L) ο βασιλευς (+ περι του L) Μαρδοχαιω (Μαρδοχαιου L) θεραπευειν (+ αυτον L) εν τη αυλη (+ του βασιλεως και πασαν θυραν επιφανως τηρειν L) και εδωκεν αυτω δοματα (om L) περι τουτων G (A:16) L (A:16)

nante 𐤁 | הפיל — [המין] και εποιησεν ψηφισμα και εβαλεν κληρους 𐤄: decretum fecit et misit sortem 𐤁: και επορευθη Αμαν προς τους θεους αυτου L aft vs 10: missa est sors in urnam, quae Hebraice dicitur plur 𐤁 | פור] 𐤁: 𐤒𐤒𐤁 93b* | [הוא] 𐤁 so 93b*: om 𐤄 𐤁 | [לפני המין] 𐤁 so 93b*: om 𐤄 𐤁 | [לחדש — מיום] om L | [לְחֹדֶשׁ] Var Oc: + gens Judaeorum deberet interfici et exivit mensis 𐤁: + ωστε απολεσαι εν μια ημερα το γενος Μαρδοχαιου και επεσεν ο κληρος εις την τεσσαρεσκαидεκατην του μηνος 𐤄 (93b om): + του επιγνωαι ημεραν θανατου αυτων και βαλλει κληρους εις την τρισκαιδεκατην του μηνος L aft vs 10: + perdere gens Mardochaei quae cecidit sors in quarta decima die mense L: + 𐤁 | [שנים עשר] om 𐤄 L (𐤁 has) | [הוא] om L: [חדש] om 𐤄 𐤁 L 𐤁 | [אדר] + Νισαν L (Νεισαν 93a) aft vs 10

8 𐤁 | om 𐤁: + παραζηλωσας ο Αμαν και κινηθεις εν παντι τω θυμω αυτου ερυθρος εγενετο εκτρεπων αυτον εξ οφθαλμων αυτου L | [המין] om 𐤄 (exc 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: 93b*) 𐤁 L | [אחשורוש] ficto corde propter genus Judaeorum et dixit 𐤁: καρδια φανλη κακα περι Ισραηλ λεγων L: + λεγων 𐤄 (om 93b) | [אחד] om 𐤁 𐤄 𐤁 L | [ומיפרד] om 𐤄 (exc 93b*) L: incredible 𐤁 | [בין העמים] om 𐤁 𐤁 L | [מדינות] om 𐤄 𐤁 L | [מלכותך] 𐤁: 𐤁 | [ורתיהם] + 𐤁: 𐤁 | [במכל עם] om 𐤁 𐤁 L | [המלך] σου βασιλεν L: tuis 𐤁 | [עשים] + et optime nosti 𐤁: + qui cognoscuntur in omni pestilentia et praecepta tua spernunt 𐤁: + γνωριζομενοι εν πασι τοις εθνεσι ποιηροιντες και τα προσταγματα σου αθετουσι L | [להניחם — ולמלך] προς καθαιρεσιν της δοξης σου L; in diem munitiois gloriae tuae 𐤁

9 [טוב] + και αγαθη η κρισις εν καρδια αυτου L: + et optimum est sensui tuo 𐤁 | [יכתב לאבדם] δοθητω μοι το εθνος εις απωλειαν L: detur mihi genus hoc in perditionem 𐤁 | [לאבדם] om 𐤄 𐤁 | [כסה] om 𐤁 𐤁 | [להביא — על] om 𐤄 (exc 93b*, 𐤁 c. a mg) L 𐤁 | [על] so Oc: אל var Or | [להביא] om 𐤁 | [המלך²] tuae 𐤁: tuo 𐤁: om L

10 aft 3:11 L | [טבעהו] + quo utebatur 𐤁: + αυτου A | [מעל ידו] om 𐤄 𐤁 | [ויתנה] + εις χειρα(ς) 𐤄 𐤁 (exc 𐤁*) | [בן] om 𐤄 𐤁 L: + σφραγισαι κατα των γεγραμμενων κατα των Ιουδαιων 𐤄

11 [המלך] om 𐤁 | [להמין] eum 𐤁: αυτω L: om 𐤁 𐤁 | [הכסה] + quod tu polliceris 𐤁

12 [הראשון] + 𐤁 | [בו — ויקראו] om L | [המלך] + 𐤁 | [יום בו] om 𐤄 (exc 𐤁 c. a mg, 93b ÷): ο μεν Νισαν (και) 𐤁 c. a mg inf, 93b ÷ | [יכתב] om 𐤄 (exc 𐤁 c. a mg, 93b ÷): 𐤁 | [וירכתב] om 𐤁 | [אשר — ככל] 𐤁: 𐤁 | [המלך²] om L | [ככל] om 𐤄 𐤁 (exc 93b*) | [המין] + scribis 𐤁 | [אל] + omnes 𐤁 | [המלך²] om 𐤄 (exc 93b*) | [על] + 𐤁 𐤄 𐤁 L | [מדינה] τας χωρας L: πολεις

93a | וּמִדִּינָהּ | om G (exc N^{c, a}) L (exc 93a): + απο Ινδικης εως της Αιθιοπίας ταις εκατον εικοσι επτα χωραις G L (93b ÷) | וְאֵל — נִכְתָּב | om L | וְאֵל שָׁרִי | om J | עֵם וְעַם | חֲמֵן S: των εθνων κατα την αυτων λεξιν G: *uni-uscujusque loci gentium secundum interpretationem eorum* L | מִדִּינָהּ — כָּל־שָׂוֶה | om G L | אֶחָד־שָׁוֶה | so Oc: var Or אֶחָד־שָׁוֶה | om J G: pr και 93b L | הַמִּלֵּךְ — וְנַחֲחָם | om G (exc 93b *) | וְנַחֲחָם | וְנַחֲחָם | Ba G: και σφραγίζον L | הַמִּלֵּךְ⁴ | *ipsius* J: + ου γαρ εστιν ος αποστραψει την σφραγιδα L

13 וְנִשְׁלַח — הָרָצִים | και απεσταλη δια βιβλιαφορων G (βιβλιογραφων 243, 248, C, Ald): και εσπευσε και εδωκεν εις χειρας τρεχοντων υππεων L (tr aft 3:13b): *et dimissae sunt litterae per librarios* L | הַמִּלֵּךְ — אֵל | om L 44, 106: εις την Αρταξερξου βασιλειαν G L | לְהָרֶג וּלְאַבֵּד | om G L L (exc 93b *) | לְהָרֶג | pr γ S J | וּלְאַבֵּד | om J | כָּל | אֵל | το γενοσ G L | מִנְעָר — נָשִׁים | om G L (exc 93b *): απο αρσενικου εως θηλυκου και διαρπαζειν τα νηπια L | לָבוֹז — בָּיוֹם | om L | בְּשִׁלּוּשָׁה עֶשֶׂר | om G L (exc 93b *) | שְׁנַיִם עֶשֶׂר | *undecimo* L: om S | הָוָא | om S | הָדָז | om S G L (exc 93b *) | וְשִׁלְלָם | *et abstulerunt* S: και τα υπαρχοντα αυτων G L | לָבוֹז | διαρπασαι G L: + וְשִׁלְלָם | *et abstulerunt* S: + the following section (B:1-7) in G L L

ADDITION B

- ¹Τῆς^a δὲ ἐπιστολῆς ἐστὶν τὸ ἀντίγραφον τόδε^b Βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀρταξέρξης^c τοῖς^d ἀπὸ^e τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἕως^f τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἑκατὸν^g εἴκοσι^h ἑπτὰ χωρῶν ἄρχουσιⁱ καὶ τοπάρχαις^j ὑποτεταγμένοις^k τὰδε^l
 2 γράφει.^m πολλῶν ἐπάρξας ἐθνῶνⁿ καὶ πάσης ἐπικρατήσας^b οἴκου-
 μένης, ἐβουλήθη^c μὴ^d τῷ θράσει τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐπαιρόμενος^e ἐπιει-
 κέστερον^f δὲ καὶ μετὰ ἡπιότητος^g ἀεὶ^h διεξάγωνⁱ τοὺς^j τῶν ὑποτε-
 ταγμένων^k ἀκυμάτους^l διὰ παντὸς καταστήσαι^m βίους,ⁿ τὴν τε^o
 βασιλείαν ἡμερον^p καὶ πορευτὴν^q μέχρι^r περάτων παρεξόμενος^s ἀνα-
 νεώσασθαι τε^t τὴν^u ποθουμένην^v τοῖς^w πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εἰρήνην.^x

B: 1 a-b και υπεγραψε την υποτεταγμενην επιστολην L: *epistola autem scripta est duo decima similitudine cuius est exemplum hoc* L: (και) το αντιγραφον της επιστολης τοδε 44, 106 | c Ασσυριος L: Artaxerxes L | d της 93a | e απο 19, 103b: in L | f μεχρι 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | g + και L | h εικοσι και L A 93b | i αρχουσι L: αρχοντων 19, 103b | j σατραπαις L | k om L | l-m qui vere qui proprie sentiunt quae in nos salutem L

2 a-o om 93a | b + της L | c εβουλευθην 93b: scribo igitur L | d om 93b, 106 | e επαρμενος 108a: tr with f A a | g πραοτητος N c: a: πισοτητος A | h om L 249 | i διεξαγειν 93a: διεξαγων 93b | j-k τους υποτεταγμενους 71, 76: om των 74 | l-so B A N 93b: most codd B a b ακυμαντους: αταραχους L: execrabilis L | m stratum L | n βιον 71, 76, 248, C: vitae sed L | o de L | p ημερον A N 52, 55, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 243, 248, 249, C, Ald | q pertinens L | r αχρι A L 93b: + των 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | s παρεχομενος L: παρεξομενον 44, 106, 120, 236: παρεξομενων 55 | t om L | u-x την πασιν ανθρωποις ποθουμενην ειρηνην L | v πορθουμενην 44 | w om L: παρα A | x praestans L

³ πυθομένου^a δέ μου τῶν συμβούλων πῶς ἂν ἀχθείη τοῦτο ἐπὶ πέρας,^b 3
 σωφροσύνη^c παρ' ἡμῖν^d διενέγκας^e καὶ^f ἐν τῇ^g εὐνοίᾳ ἀπαρallάκτως^h
 καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστειⁱ ἀποδεδιγμένους^j καὶ^k δεύτερον^l τῶν^m βασιλειῶνⁿ
 γέρας^o ἀπειρηγεγμένος^p Ἀμὰν ἐπέδειξεν^a ἡμῖν,^b ἐν^c πάσαις^d ταῖς 4
 κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην φυλαῖς ἀναμεμίχθαι^e δυσμενῇ^f λαόν^g τινα,^h
 τοῖςⁱ νόμοις ἀντίθετον^j πρὸς πᾶν ἔθνος, τὰ τε^k τῶν βασιλέων^l παρα-
 πέμποντας^m διηνεκῶς προστάγματα,ⁿ πρὸς^o τὸ μὴ κατατίθεσθαι^p
 τὴν ὑφ' ἡμῶν^q κατευθυνομένην ἀμέμπτως^r συναρχίαν.^s ⁵ διειληφότες^a 5
 οὖν τόδε^b τὸ^c ἔθνος μονώτατον^d ἐν^e ἀντιπαραγωγῇ^f παντὶς διὰ παντὸς
 ἀνθρώπων^h κείμενον,ⁱ διαγωγῇ^j νόμων^k ξενίζουσιν^l παραλλάσσον,^m
 καὶ δυσνοοῦνⁿ τοῖς ἡμετέροις^o πράγμασιν^p τὰ χεῖριστα^q συντελοῦν^r
 κακὰ καὶ^s πρὸς^t τὸ μὴ τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας^u τυγχάνειν.^v ⁶ προσ- 6
 τετάχαμεν οὖν^a τοὺς σημαινομένους ὑμῖν^b ἐν^c τοῖς γεγραμμένοις^d
 ὑπὸ Ἀμὰν^e τοῦ^f τεταγμένου^g ἐπὶ^h τῶν πραγμάτωνⁱ καὶ δευτέρου
 πατρὸς^j ἡμῶν,^k πάντας^l σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἀπολέσαι^m ὁλορριζεῖⁿ
 ταῖς^o τῶν ἐχθρῶν^p μαχαίραις^q ἄνευ παντὸς^r οἴκτου^s καὶ φειδύς^t τῇ^u
 τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ τοῦ δωδεκάτου^v μηνὸς^w Ἀδὰρ τοῦ^x ἐνεστῶτος
 ἔτους,^y ὅπως^a οἱ πάλοι καὶ^b νῦν δυσμενεῖς^c ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ^d βιαίως^e 7

3 α πυθανομενου L N c. a A: πυθανομενων 19, 93a, 108b: πυθομενου 71: πυθομενων 108a: ποθυομενου Ald | b + o many codd L | c σωφροσύνης o A: σωφροσύνην N: σωφρονην 55 | d υμιν A 93b: παρειμι 249 | e διεννηχως L: διαπρεψοντας 249: διαπρεψας 52, 55, 64, 243, 248, C: διατρεψας Ald | f -gom L | h ἀπαρallάκτω L C: παρallάκτω 19, 108b | i πιστις 93a | j -i tr N | l om L | k το L: το δε 93a | l δευτερος 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120 | m -n το βασιλειον 71, 76: των βασιλειων N* A | m -o sig-norumi ad finem L | o γηρας 19, 108b: περας 93a | p ανενεγκαμενος L

4 α υπεδειξεν L: απεδειξεν C | b + παροικον L 93b: + παροικος 19, 108b | c -d om N* | e ανα-μεμιχας 19 | f -s tr 44 | g -h tr L | g om L | h + legibus nostris non ambulantes L | i + μεν L | j αντι-τυπον N A 93b: αντιδικοντα L: αντιδικουν 93a | k δε L | l βασιλειων 236 | m παραπεμποντα L: παραπεμποντες N* | n διαταγματα B a b over eras, N A | k -n regum autem praetermittentes super-vacue ad res L | o -s προς το μηδεποτε την βασιλειαν ευσταθειας τυγχανειν L: nam ante propter quod non componerent quod a nobis regitur sine querela L | p κατατεινεσθαι C | q υμων 64 | r αμεμπτον 52, 55: αμιγως 108a: απεμπτως Ald

5 α -t disparsum hoc genus singularis contra eos estote L | b om L | c -d tr L | g -m om 93a | g -i παντος κειμενον των ανθρωπων L | g -s om L | h ανθρωπων N*: ανων A: ανων 93b | j δια των L: δια τον 19 | k νομον 19 | l ξενιζουσα N*: pr eras 1 let A | m παραγωγην L: παρallασσων N*, 44, 106: παρallαξιν N c. a A 93b | n δυσνοη B b (δυσνθη), A: δυσνονιτος 44, 106 | o υμετεροις 93a | p προσταγμα-σι(v) N c. a L 71, 76: + αι L 93b: πραγμα N* | q αχειριστα 44, 71, 106: + τε C | r συντελειν L: συντελουστας 71, 74, 76 | s om L N* | t -v προς το μηδεποτε κατατιθεσθαι τη υφ ημων κατευθυνομενη μοναρχια L | u most codd ευσταθειας: ευσταθειαν 236 | v τυγχανειαν 236

6 α υμιν L: om N c. a | b nobis L 52, 93b | c -d om L: εν τοις γραμμασιν 249: + υμιν 93b | e -s tr 93a | f -k om 71 | h υπο 52 | i over eras and mg B a b (ταγματων B* ph) | j -k patre vestro L | l -n ολορ-ριζους απολεσαι συν γυναιξι και τεκνοις L | n ολοριζει N A N 44, 64, 71, 93b, 106, 120, 236, Ald: οδορριζει 55: ολλοριζει 76: ολορριζει 108a, 249: ολορριζους 248 C | o om 248 C | p εθνων A | q μαχαις A: + qui legibus non parent L | r om 249 | s οικτρον N*: οικον 93a | t φιδω N* (φιδους N c. a) | u -y om 71 | v -w μηνος του δωδεκατου ουτος ο μην L | x -y os est Δυστρος L: + φονευειν παντας τους Ιουδαιους και αρπαζειν τα νηπια L

7 α ινα L | b -c δυσμενεις και νυν L | d -e μιaws 93b | e om L: δικαιως 249

εἰς^f τὸν ἄδην καταλθόντες^g εἰς τὸν μετέπειτα χρόνον^h εὐσταθῇⁱ καὶ
ἀτάραχα^j παρέχωσιν^k ἡμῖν διὰ τέλους τὰ πράγματα.^l

7 ἡ-ε συνελθόντες εἰς τὸν Ἀθὴν L | ὁ μ L | ἡ-ευσταθῶσιν καὶ μὴ διὰ τῶν παρεχῶσιν ἡμῖν
πραγματὰ L | ἀταραχὸν N* (χα N.c.a) | παρεχούσιν A 71 | προστάγματα A: + qui autem celer-
verit gentes Iudaeorum, inhabitabiles, non solum inter homines, sed nec inter aves; et igni
sancto comburetur, et substantia ejus in regnum conferetur. Vale L

CHAPTER III

14 om L 71 | פתשני הזהב | *summa epistolarum haec fuit* א: *τα δε*
 αντιγραφα των επιστολων G: om L | להפתח | להפתח Ba G: *ut scirent* א:
 εξετιθετο G: *et imperatum est* L | דת | om א S G L (exc 93b*) | בכל | om
 כל G: *omnibus* L | מדינה — העמים | om L | ומדינה | om G (exc 93b*) |
 גלוי | om א | גלוי S: *και προσεταγη* G | עתידים | so N¹ S
 Br CB¹: עתרים Ba G | הזהב | *statutum* L

15 הרצים — הרצים | om L | [הניכך] — הרצים | om L (exc 93b*) |
 [המלך] | om L (exc 93b*) | εσπενδeto δε το πραγμα G H (γραμμα 52, 64) |
 [הרופים בדבר] some oddd and oddd: + et convivium fecerunt omnes gentes L | [הבירה] | om A
 G L (exc 93b*) | [להדת נתנה] | om G (exc 93b*) | [בשונן] |
 Aman autem cum introisset regiam cum amicis luxuriabatur L | [לשתות] | S | [אסף] |
 tr aft 4:1 L: om L (cf. 4:3): et cunctis Judaeis qui in urbe erant flentibus A | [שושן] so B²: שושן Ba G: om A G (exc 93b*): + επι τοις γεγεννη-
 μenois L | : + Et invocabant Judaei Deum patrum suorum, et dicebant:
Domine Deus, tu solus Deus in coelo sursum, et non est alius Deus praeter te.
Si enim fecissemus legem tuam et praecepta, habitassemus forsitan
cum pace omne tempus vitae nostrae: nunc autem, quoniam non fecimus
praecepta tua, supervenit in nos omnis tribulatio ista. Justus es, et
tranquillus, et excelsus, et magnus, Domine, et omnes viae tuae iudicia.
Et nunc Deus non des filios tuos in captivitatem, neque uxores nostras
in violationem, neque in perditionem: qui factus es nobis propitiuss ab
Aegypto, et usque nunc, miserere principali tuae, parce, et non des
haereditatem nostram in infaniam, ut hostes dominantur nostri. Et in
Susis, in civitate proxima regi, propositum erat exemplum, et
cognita erant scripta (followed by A: 3, q. v.) L

CHAPTER IV

IV, 1 [ומרדכי] *et hic* א | כל | om & א | [אשר נעשה] *scripta quae erant in epistola* א: + 3: 15, 4: 3 in part *q. v.* L | [ויקרא] *περιελετο* L | [מרדכי] om β & א: + ελθων εις τον οικον αυτου L | [שק] + και καταπασαιτο & א (ex 71: 93b ÷) | [ואשר] + *super caput ejus* א: και σφοδωθεις L: om 71 | [ומיה – ריצא] om L | [ריצא] om יצא β | [בתוך] *διω της πλαταιας* &: *per totam plateam* א | [וירעק] + *εν Συσοις τη πολει* 93b ÷ | [וענה] *et vociferans*

ℒ: om 71 | גדולה | om ℒ 71 | וּבִמְרֵה | om ℒ: ostendens amaritudinem animi sui et hoc ejulatu ℒ: + ab aula virili usque ad portam muliebrem clamans: gens perit nihil mali faciens ℒ: + αἰρεται εἶδος μηδεν ἡδίκηκος ℒ

2 יִרְבּוּא | et sedit ℒ | עַד | in ℒ | לִפְנֵי | om S: atrio ℒ | שְׁעָר | ℒ: αυλην L: aulae ℒ: της πολεως 93b: της αυλης A | הַמִּלְךְ | ℒ: την εξω L: muliebris ℒ: om 93b: + και εστη ℒ L | אֵין | + אֶל | שְׁעָר | ℒ: αυλην ℒ: πυλην N^{c.a mg} 93b: om L | הַמִּלְךְ | om ℒ: της πολεως 93b: τα βασιλεια L | שָׁר | + και σποδον ℒ (93b ÷)

3 tr to 4:1 L: tr to 3:15 end ℒ | מְדִינָה | πολει L: om ℒ | וּמְדִינָה | oppidis ℒ: om ℒ S (exc N^{c.a (mg)}, 93b*) | מְגִיעַ — וּמְדִינָה | om L | מְקוֹם | ac locis ℒ | דָּבָר | τα γραμματα ℒ: exemplum epistolae ℒ (το προσ-
ταγμα N^{c.a (mg)}) | הַמִּלְךְ | om ℒ (exc N^{c.a mg}, 93b*) | וְדָחוּ | crudele ℒ: om S ℒ | אָבֵל | pr και ℒ L: + et luctus ℒ: tr aft וּבִסְפָד | גדול | + εγενετο 44: + εγενετο 74, 76, 106, 236: + και πικρον L | לִיהָדִים | + omnes ℒ L | וְצוּם — לָרִבִּים | om L ℒ | וְצוּם | om ℒ (exc 93b*) | קְרָאָה | κλαυθ-
μος 93b*) | וּבִסְפָד | + ην και A: + και 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, C | יָצַע | pro strato utentibus ℒ | לָרִבִּים | εαντοis ℒ

4 וּתְבוּאִינָה — וּסְרִיסִיָּה | και εκαλεσεν ευνουχον ενα και απεστειλε προς Εσθηρ L: et audivit Hester regina vocem Mardochaei fratris sui Hebraica voce lingua ℒ | וּתְבוּאִינָה | Q Oc: سحرة S | גַּעֲרוֹת | om S | וּסְרִיסִיָּה | om S | מָאֵד — רִיגִידוֹ | om L ℒ | הַמִּלְכָּה מָאֵד | quod audiens ℒ: ακουσασα το γεγονος ℒ | מַעֲלִיָּו — וְתִשְׁלַח | και ειπεν η βασι-
λισσα περιελεσθε τον σακκον L: et missit spadonem, qui praesto erat in conspectu ipsius, dicens: vade, exi celerius hinc, et auferes vestimenta quae est indutus, et indue illum vestimenta alia ℒ | בְּגָדִים | om ℒ (exc 93b*) | אַתְּ מְדַרְכִּי | eum ℒ | מַעֲלִיָּו | + και εισαγαγετε αυτον L: + et veni ad me, ut sciam quid vult frater meus, quoniam vocem fratris mei audio, magnam vocem tribulationis et planctus, et plorationis, et angustiae, et necessitatis, et exiit spado et dixit ei ℒ | וְלֹא קָבַל | et noluit Mardochaeus deponere saccum et omnem humilationem suam ℒ

5 om L ℒ | לְהָתֵן | var Oc: Athach ℒ: سحرة + سحرة S: Αχραθαιον ℒ: Αχραθειον A: Εγχαθαδιον 44: Αθακ 93b (so always): Εγχα-
θαιον 106: Αθαχ C (so always) | הַמִּלְךְ | aft אֲשֶׁר ℒ: αυτης ℒ: om 249 | לְדַעַת | + ut iret ℒ | וְתִצְוָה | ℒ: לפניה — אֲשֶׁר | + ab eo ℒ: + αυτη ℒ (93b ÷): + αυτον N^{c.a} A N 71, 74, 76, 120, 236, 249 | מִהָזָה | το ακριβες ℒ: ÷ το ακριβες * τι τουτο 93b: om 71 | וְעַל — זֶה | om ℒ ℒ (exc 93b*) | זֶה | om S

6 om ℒ L (exc 93b*): N^{c.a mg} has εις την πλατειαν της πολεως η εστιν κατα προσωπον της πυλης της πολεως: A has επι την πλατειαν προς τη (τη A* τα sup ras A^a) βασιλεια | הַמִּלְךְ | palatii ℒ

7 om L | וְיִגַּד — קִרְהוֹ | om ℒ | כָּל | om ℒ (exc N^{c.a mg}, 93b*) | וְאֵת — end of vs] simul de decem millibus talentorum quae dedit Aman pretium

perditionis Judaeorum 1L (tr aft 4:8) | [הכסה] om 6 (exc 8^{c.a.ms}, 93b*) | [לשקול] om 6 (exc 8^{c.a.}, 93b*) | [על] + [על] 8: την γαζαν 6 | [המלך] om 8: + μυριων ταλαντων 6 1L | [ביהודיים] Q Oc: 6 | [ביהודיים] var Oc

8 [ואת] — [אסתר] om L 71: tr w rest of vs 1L | [כתב] so Ben Asher: Ben Naphtali (Ginsburg): om 8 6 (exc 8^{c.a.}, 93b*) | [הדת] om 8 6 1L (exc 8^{c.a.}, 93b*) | [להשמידם] om 1L | [נתן] om 44, 74, 76, 106, 236 | [להשמידם] om 3 8 | [נתן] missit 1L | [לו] confestim 1L | [להראות] — [אסתר] om 1L | [אסתר] reginae 3 | [ולהגיד] και ειπεν 6 1L: αλλ ειπεν L: om 3 8 | [לה] αυτω 6: ουτως L: spadoni 1L: om 3 8 | [ולצוות] εντειλασθαι 6: ερειτε L: vade dic 1L | [לבוא] — end of vs | surge, quid sedes et taces? quoniam venundata es, tu et domus tua et patris tui, et gens et omnis progenies: surge si poterimus pro gente nostra laborare et pati, ut Deus propitius fiat genti nostrae 1L | [לבוא] — [לא] μη αποστρεψης του εισελθειν προς τον βασιλεα L | [לבוא] εισελθουσιν A | [ולבקש מלפניו] om 3 71 | [על] + εμου και L | [עמך] του λαου 6 L: + και της πατριδος 8^{c.a.ms} A, 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 249, 93b*: +

μνησθείσα^a ἡμερῶν ταπεινώσεώς σου ὡς^b ἐτράφης^c ἐν^d χειρί μου, διότι^e Ἀμὰν ὁ δευτερεύων^f τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐλάλησεν^g καθ' ἡμῶν εἰς θάνατον· ἐπικάλεσαι^h τὸνⁱ κύριον^j καὶ^k λάλησον τῷ^l βασιλεῖ^m περὶ ἡμῶνⁿ καὶ^o ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ θανάτου^p 6 L

^a μνησθεις αφ 8* (μνησθισα 8^{c.a.}) | ^b wον L: on 93a | ^c εστραφης A: ετραφη 55 | ^d + τη L | ^e δια i A: οτι L 93a | ^f δευτερων 8* | ^g λεαληκε bef τω L | ^h p-om 71, 249 | ⁱ επικαλεσαμενη L: + ον L 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | ^j om 74, 76, 106, 120 | ^k τον L | ^l m aft n L | ^m om some codd

9 Factum est autem cum legisset Hester litteras fratris sui, scidit vestimentum suum et exclamavit voce amara et gravi, et ploravit ploratione magna, et corpus ejus formidolosum factum est, et caro ipsius concidit valde 1L | [ויבוא התך] om L | [התך] cf. 4:5: Αχθραθιος 8* A: Αχχραθιος 44 | [ריגד] — 4:10 | [להתך] om 93b | [לאסתר] so 8* A, 64, 243, 249, C, Ald: αυτη 6 L | [את] — [מרדכי] την οδυνην του Ισραηλ L | [את] + παντας 6 (exc 44, 71, 74, 76, 106) | [מרדכי] τουτους 6

10 [והאמר] — [להתך] om L | [והאמר] et misit 1L | [אסתר] om 3 1L | [להתך] spadonem suum 1L: προς αυτον 44, 106: ei 3 | [והצוהו] πορευθητι 6: om 1L | [אל] על Sēbhūr cf. 4:5: κατα L | [מרדכי] ταδε L: ταυτα 93a: eum 1L: + και ειπον (+ αυτω 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 236) οτι 6: + λεγουσα L: + [dicens] 1L: + [לעל] 8

11 [מדינות] — [כל] om L 1L | [המלך] — [ועם] om 6 8 (exc 8^{c.a.ms}, 93b*) | [ועם] et cunctae 3: [המלך] quae sub ditione sunt 3: Artaxerxes rex 1L: sv L | [יודעים] so N¹ N² Br: ידעים Ba G: γινωσκεις L: dixit 1L | [כל]

para pantas L | איש ואשה | homo omnis gentis ℒ: om L | אֵל² — [להנמיח] om L | הפנימית | so A ℒ: την εσωτεραν ℒ | אהח — [להנמיח] absque ulla cunctatione statim interficiatur ℒ: ουκ εστιν αυτω σωτηρια ℒ: θανατου ενοχος εσται L (aft [הזהב] | לך) om ℒ ℒ L (exc A^{c. a}, 93b) | [המלך] om L | [שרביט] + αυτου L | [הזהב] + pro signo clementiae ℒ | [ויהי] om L | [לבוא] om L | [המלך] αυτου L | [שלושים] | יום | S | [יום] + igitur quomodo ad regem intrare potero ℒ: + et quomodo introibo ad regem et exiit ℒ + και πως εισελευσομαι νυν ακλητος ουσα L: + και απελθων 71

12 om L | ויגידו | S: και απηγγειλεν ℒ: + Αχραθαιος ℒ (Αρχαθαιος A: cf. 4:5): + spado ℒ | [למרדכי] illi ℒ: + παντας ℒ (93b ÷) | את — [אסתר] om ℒ: ταυτα 71: verba ipsius + et iratus est Mardochoaeus ℒ

13 [ויאמר] και απεστειλε L | [מרדכי] om ℒ ℒ: + προς Αχραθαιον (Αχθραθαιον A) πορευθητι και ℒ (93b ÷) (om προς Αχραθαιον A 71: αυτω 44, 106): + προς αυτην L: + spadoni intra ℒ | [להשיב] rursum ℒ: ειπον ℒ ℒ: και ειπεν L | [אל] αυτη ℒ ℒ L | [אסתר] +icens ℒ: om L ℒ 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 236 | [אל] — end of vs | om L | [להמלט] salva fiat ℒ: + tantum ℒ: + [ונגד] S: + [מונה] ℒ ℒ | [בית המלך] pr [יג] S: εν τη βασιλεια ℒ ℒ: + [ונגד] S | [היהודים] + quoniam uxor regis sum ℒ

14 [כי] ως οτι ℒ: οτι A, 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: om S L | [הקשר] om ℒ ℒ L (exc A^{c. ams}, 93b*) | [תחרישי] παρακουσης ℒ: υπεριδης L: non praemiseris ℒ | [בעת הזה] του εθνους σου + του μη βοηθησαι αυτοις αλλ L | [ויהי] [יג] S: om ℒ: βοηθεια ℒ ℒ: βοηθος L | [והצלה] και σκεπη ℒ: et defensor ℒ: και σωτηρια L | [יעמוד] pr ουκ 106 | [ליהודים] [ליהודים] G: αυτοις L (εν αυτοις 93a) | [אחר] per occasione[m] aliam ℒ: αλλοθεν ℒ ℒ: ο θεος L | [כזאת] + [ו] S | [למלכות] + ut in tali tempore parareris ℒ: + ut gentem tuam liberes. Et introiit spado, et renuntiavit verba Mardochoaei Hester reginae ℒ: + και απελθων απηγγειλεν αυτη 71

15 [ותאמר] και (εξ)απεστειλεν ℒ L | [אסתר] η βασιλισσα L | [להשיב] rursum ℒ: τον ηκοντα προς αυτην ℒ (om προς αυτην A): denuo cum misset qui ad eam venerat ℒ: om L | [מרדכי] [אל] a Mardochoaeo + domine frater, si tibi videtur introibo, licet moriar ℒ: + haec verba ℒ: om L: + λεγουσα ℒ L

16 [לך] om L ℒ | [היהודים] — כנוס | παραγγειλατε θεραπειαν L: praedica igitur sanitatem ℒ | [כל] om ℒ (exc A^{c. a}, 93b* [מוי] παντας | [הנמצאים] | S: om ℒ ℒ L | [בשושן] + [ו] S: om L ℒ | [וצומו] — [יום] και δεηθητε του θεου εκτεως L: et annuntia jejunium; et dicito presbyteris ut faciant jejunium, lactantes autem separent nocte a matribus suis, boves et pecora non pascantur quibus diebus ℒ | [וצומו] et orate ℒ | [ראל] om | 57 codd R, N¹ ℒ¹ ℒ | [גם] | 72 codd R, ℒ¹ ℒ¹ ℒ ℒ L: om

ℒ | אֲנִי־מֵי־חַיִּים L | כֵּן | om ℒ 6 (exc N^{c. a.}, 93b*) | רַבְּכָן | om γ S: και
 τότε 6 ℒ: και L | אֲשֶׁר — כִּדְתָהּ | παρα τον νομον 6: ακλητος L: + non vocata
 J: om ℒ | וְאֲשֶׁר — אֲבִדְתִּי² | εαν και απολεσθαι με η (δεη) 6: ει δεοι και
 αποθανειν με L: habens in manu animam meam + exiit spado et dixit
 verba ejus ℒ: tradensque me morti et periculo J

17 וַיַּעֲבֵר | om יַעֲבֵר L | וַיַּעַשׂ — end of vs] *praedicavit sanitatem:*
sponsi autem de thalamis exierunt, et sponsae de pascuis suis; presby-
teri autem et anus exierunt ad deprecandum: boves et pecora prae-
cepit, ut tribus diebus et tribus noctibus non pascerentur. Omnes
autem acceperunt cinerem, et invocabant excelsum Dominum, ut prop-
itius illorum fieret humilitati. Mardocheus vero conscidit vestimenta
sua, et substravit cilicium, et cecidit super faciem suam in terram, et
presbyteri populi a mane usque ad vesperam ℒ: και εποιησεν ουτως L |
 כָּכָל | om כ R 486 J S 6 (exc N^{c. a mg. inf.} 93b) | אֲחֵרֵי | + the following
 passage (C: 1-30) in 6 L ℒ

ADDITION C

- ¹₂ ¹καὶ^a ἐδείθη^b Κυρίου, μνημονεύων πάντα^c τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου,^d ²καὶ
 εἶπεν^a Κύριε,^b κύριε^c βασιλεῦ^d πάντων^e κρατῶν,^f ὅτι ἐν^g ἐξουσίᾳ σου
 τὸ^h πᾶν ἐστίν,ⁱ καὶ^j οὐκ ἔστιν^k ὁ^l ἀντιδοξῶν^m σοι ἐνⁿ τῷ θέλειν σε
 3 σῶσαι τὸν^o Ἰσραήλ. ³ὅτι σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ
 4 πᾶν^a θαυμαζόμενον ἐν τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανόν,^b ⁴καὶ^a κύριος^b εἶ^c πάντων,
 5 καὶ^d οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἀντιτάξεται^e σοι τῷ κυρίῳ.^f ⁵σὺ^a πάντα^b γινώσκεις,^c
 σὺ^d οἶδας, Κύριε,^e ὅτι^f οὐκ ἐν ὕβρει οὐδέ^g ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ^h οὐδὲ ἐν
 φιλοδοξίᾳ ἐποίησα τοῦτο,ⁱ τὸ^j μὴ προσκυνεῖν τὸν ὑπερήφανον^k Ἀμάν.^l
 6 ⁶ὅτι^a ἠυδόκουν^b φιλεῖν^c πέλματα^d ποδῶν αὐτοῦ^e πρὸς^f σωτηρίαν^g
 7 Ἰσραήλ, ⁷ἀλλὰ ἐποίησα τοῦτο^a ἵνα μὴ^b θῶ δόξαν ἀνθρώπου^c ὑπεράνω
 δόξης θεοῦ.^d καὶ οὐ^e προσκυνήσω οὐδένα^f πλὴν σοῦ τοῦ^g κυρίου^h

C: 1 a-d om 71 ℒ | b + του L 44: pr Μαρδοχαιος N^{c. a} | c-d αυτου τα εργα L | d αυτου 44: του κυριου 93b N^{c. a}

2 a et dixerunt ℒ | b-f δεσποτα παντοκρατωρ L: Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Jacob, benedictus es ℒ | c θε A: om 71 | d-f βασιλευς παντοκρατωρ C, Ald | e-f παντοκρατωρ (op) N N^{c. a} 44, 52, 64, 71, 74, 76, 106, 108a, 120, 236, 243, 248, 249 | g-5c om ℒ | g + τη L | h-i εστι τα παντα L | g-8b om 71 | h τουτο Ald | j-k om 93b | l ος L | m αντιταξεται L | n-3c om 93a | o + οικον L

3 a-b om 106 | a + το L

4 a om A: + συ L | b-c κυριευεις L | d-f om L | e αντιτασεται N*

5 a + γαρ L | b παντων 55, 93b | c γινωσκεις A: + και το γενος Ισραηλ L: + και 249 | d om 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | e-f και ουκ οτι L | g κυριος Ald | f-1 om ℒ | g-h om L | i om L | j του L: om 74, 76, 106, 120, 249 | k απεριτμητον L

6 a-c quoniam non mihi placet plantas pedum Aman adorare ℒ | a επει L | b ευδοκουν N A L 44, 74, 106, 108b, 120, 236, 248, 249, C | c φιλησαι L: om 93a | d τα πελματα των L: το πελμα των 93a | f-g ευκεν τον L

7 a om L: + ουκ ιτα ℒ | b-d μηδενα προταξω της δοξης σου δεσποτα | e ανθρωπω N^{c. a} 52: ανθρωπων N* | d + μου N^{c. a} A 93b ℒ | e-f μηδενα προσκυνησω L | f ουθενα A | g om C | h κυριε

μου,ⁱ καὶ οὐ ποιήσω αὐτὰ^j ἐν ὑπερφανίᾳ.^k ⁸ καὶ νῦν, Κύριε ὁ^a θεὸς **8**
 ὁ βασιλεὺς^b ὁ θεὸς^c Ἀβραάμ,^d φείσαι^e τοῦ λαοῦ^f σου, ὅτι ἐπιβλέ-
 πουσιν^g ἡμῖν εἰς καταφθορὰν καὶ ἐπεθύμησαν^h ἀπολέσαιⁱ τὴν ἐξ
 ἀρχῆς κληρονομίαν σου· ⁹ μὴ^a ὑπερίδῃς τὴν μερίδα σου ἣν^b σεαυτῷ^c **9**
 ἐλυτρώσω ἐκ γῆς^d Αἰγύπτου· ¹⁰ ἐπάκουσον τῆς δεήσεώς μου^a καὶ **10**
 ἰλάσθητι τῷ^b κλήρῳ^c σου, καὶ^d στρέψον^e τὸ πένθος ἡμῶν^f εἰς εὐ-
 χίαν,^g ἵνα ζῶντες ὑμῶμέν^h σουⁱ τὸ ὄνομα,^j Κύριε,^k καὶ μὴ ἀφανίσῃς
 στόμα^l αἰνούντων^m σοι.ⁿ ¹¹ καὶ^a πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ ἐκέκραξαν^b ἐξ ἰσχύος **11**
 αὐτῶν, ὅτι^c θάνατος^d αὐτῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν.^e ¹² Καὶ Ἐσθὴρ ἡ^a **12**
 βασίλισσα^b κατέφυγεν^c ἐπὶ^d τὸν^e κύριον ἐν ἀγῶνι^f θανάτου κατει-
 λημμένη,^g ¹³ καὶ^a ἀφελομένη^b τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς^c ἐνεδύσατο **13**
 ἱμάτια^d στενοχωρίας^e καὶ^f πένθους,^g καὶ^h ἀντὶ τῶνⁱ ὑπερφάνων
 ἡδυσμάτων^j σποδοῦ καὶ^k κοπριῶν^l ἔπλησεν^m τὴν κεφαλὴνⁿ καὶ^o τὸ
 σῶμα^p ἔταπείνωσεν σφόδρα,^q καὶ^r πάντα τόπον^s κόσμου^t ἀγαλλιά-
 ματος αὐτῆς^u ἔπλησε^v στρεπτῶν τριχῶν αὐτῆς.^w ¹⁴ καὶ^a ἐδεῖτο^b **14**
 Κυρίου θεοῦ^c Ἰσραὴλ^d καὶ^e εἶπεν^f Κύριε^g μου,^h ὅι βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν,ⁱ
 σὺ εἶ μόνος.^k βοήθησόν μοι τῇ μόνῃ^l καὶ^m μὴⁿ ἐχούσῃ βοηθὸν εἰ^o
 μὴ σέ,^p ¹⁵ ὅτι^a κίνδυνός μου ἐν^b χειρί μου. ¹⁶ ἐγὼ ἤκουον^a ἐκ^b γενετῆς^c **15**
16

C: αληθινου L | i om L: Deus 2L | i αυτο L 248 C: om 93a | κπειρασμω L: + ουδε εν φιλοδοξια 93b: + nec in intemperante, Domine. Appare Domine, cognoscere Domine 2L

8 a-b om N L 44, 55, 106: o βασιλευς 2N: βασιλευ 2N c. a A | c διαθεμενος προς L | c-d om 52, 64, 248, C, Ald: + et Deus Isaac et Deus Jacob 2L | e + parce 2L | f δουλου 108a | g επιτεθειται L | h επιθυμουν L | i απολυσθαι A 108a, 218, C: αφανισαι και εξαραι L

9 a-10k om 71 | b την 93b | c om L | d της 74, 76

10 a ημων L | b-c της κληρονομιας L: τη κληρονομια 93a | d om 52, 64, 243, Ald | e στρεψαι 44 | f ημιν 93b | g ευφροσυνην L: + nostram 2L | h ημνησωμεν L | i σε L: aft i A N 55, 76, 93b | j-k om L | l το στομα A: το αιμα 2N* | m μυνουντων L | n σε L: σου 106: + κυριε some codd

11 a-e om L | a-cet omnis populus supervixit in fortitudine sua cum esset 2L | b εξεκρα-
 ξεν 108a: εκραξαν 249: εκραξεν 2N: εκεκραξεν A et al | c-d om 55 | c-o A | c-e om 44, 106

12 a-b om 44-106 | c-g om 2L | d-e προς 236 | f αγωνια 71, 74, 76, 93a, 106, 120, 236 | g om 71

13 a om 71 | b αφελατο L: περιελομενη Orig. iii, 598 | c αφ εαυτης + και παν σημειον επι-
 φανειας αυτης και L: + et 2L | d om L | e στενοχωριαν L: sordide 2L | g πενθος L | f-g om 2L | h-a aft
 w 2L | h-1 om 44, 106 | i om L | j + και 44 | k-l om 2L | l κοπρου L: κοπρων 108a: κοπριας 249 | m γε-
 πλησε codd | n + αυτης 2N AL | o-w om 236 | o-a om 106 | p + αυτης 2N A L | r-u και παν σημειον κοσ-
 μου αυτης και αγαλλιαματος L: et abstulit omne aurum a se 2L | s om 249 | t κοσμον 249: om 52,
 64, 243, 248, C, Ald: + του 71, 74, 76, 120: aft u A a | v-w τερπων τριχων επλησε ταπεινωσεως L: et
 subtravit sibi cilicium 2L | v επλησεν 2N: επληρωσεν A a

14 a-d et cedit super te cum ancillis suis, a mane usque ad vespem 2L | b δεδηθη
 του L 71 | c-d om L 71 | e-f λεγουσα 71 | g-k Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Jacob, bene-
 dictus es 2L | g Κυριος 76 | h ο θεος μου A 108a: ο θεος 44, 71, 74, 106, 120, 236: om L | i-k om 71,
 108a | k + βοηθος L | l ταπεινη L | m τη 93b | n ουκ L | o-p πλην σου L: + Domine 2L

15 a-22 i om 71 | 15 om 108a | b + τη A L

16 a ηκουσα L | b-f κε του πρς μου A: πατρικης μου βιβλου L: του πατρος μου 93b: in libris
 paternis meis Domine 2L | c γενεας 108a | d-e εκ φυλης 2N | g-23 c 2L has the following: quoniam
 Noe in aqua diluvii conservasti. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis Domine, quoniam tu
 Abrahae in trecentis et decem octo viris, novem reges tradidisti. Ego audiui in libris paternis
 meis Domine, quoniam tu Jonam de ventre ceti liberasti. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis

- μου ἐν^d φυλῇ^c πατριᾶς μου,^f ὅτι^g σύ,^h Κύριε,ⁱ ἔλαβες^j τὸν Ἰσραὴλ
ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ τοὺς^k πατέρας ἡμῶν^l ἐκ πάντων^m τῶν προ-
γόνων αὐτῶνⁿ εἰς^o κληρονομίαν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοῖς ὅσα^p
17 ἐλάλησας.^q 17 καὶ^a νῦν^b ἡμάρτομεν^c ἐνώπιόν^d σου, καὶ παρέδωκας
18 ἡμᾶς^e εἰς χεῖρας τῶν^f ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν.^g 18 ἀνθ' ^a ὧν^b ἔδοξάσαμεν^c τοὺς
19 θεοὺς αὐτῶν. δίκαιος εἶ, Κύριε.^d 19 καὶ νῦν^e οὐχ ἰκανώθησαν ἐν^b πι-
20 κρασμῶ δουλείας^c ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ^d ἔθηκαν^e τὰς χεῖρας^f αὐτῶν,^g 20 ἔξ᾿ ἄραι
ὀρισμὸν στόματός σου^a καὶ^b ἀφανίσαι κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ ἐμφρά-
ξαι^c στόμα^d αἰνούντων^e σοι^f καὶ σβέσαι^g δόξαν οἴκου σου καὶ θυσι-
21 αστήριόν^h σου,ⁱ 21 καὶ ἀνοίξαι στόμα^a ἔθνων^b εἰς ἄρετὰς ματαίων^c καὶ
22 θαυμασθῆναι βασιλέα σάρκινον^d εἰς^e αἰῶνα. 22 μὴ^a παραδῶς, Κύριε,^b
τὸ σκῆπτρόν^c σου^d τοῖς μὴ^e οὖσιν,^f καὶ^g μὴ καταγελασάτωσαν^h ἐνⁱ
τῇ πτώσει ἡμῶν,^j ἀλλὰ^k στρέψον τὴν βουλὴν^l αὐτῶν^m ἐπ' αὐτοὺς.ⁿ
23 τὸν δὲ ἄρξάμενον ἐφ' ^a ἡμᾶς^o παραδιγμάτισον. 23 μνήσθητι,^a Κύριε,^b
γνώσθητι ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως ἡμῶν,^c καὶ ἐμέ^d θάρσυνον,^e βασιλεῦ^f τῶν
24 θεῶν^g καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς^h ἐπικρατῶν.ⁱ 24 δὸς λόγον εὐρυθμον^a εἰς τὸ
στόμα μου^b ἐνώπιον τοῦ λέοντος,^c καὶ μετὰθες^d τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ^e
εἰς μῖσος τοῦ πολεμοῦντος ἡμᾶς, εἰς συντέλειαν αὐτοῦ^e καὶ^f τῶν ὁμο-

Domine, quoniam tu Ananiam, Azariam, Misahel, de camino ignis liberasti. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis Domine, quoniam tu Daniel de lacu leonum eruisti. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis Domine, quoniam tu Ezechiae regi Iudaeorum, morte damnato, et orante pro vita, misertus es, et donasti ei vitae annos quindecim. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis Domine, quoniam tu Annae petenti in desiderio animae, filii generationem donasti. Ego audiui in libris paternis meis Domine, quoniam tu complacentes tibi liberas Domine usque in finem | h-ελευτρωσω L | i om 120 | k om 52 | l αυτων L | m om L (exc 93a) | n αυτου 108a | o επιθεμενος αυτοις Ισραηλ L | p a L: ως 52 | q + αυτοις N A 93b, 249: + αυτοις και παρεσχον οσα ητησαν L

17 a-b om L: οτι A | b ημαρτηκαμεν A 93b: ημαρτον 19, 108b | c εναντιον L | e ημιν 93b | f-g om 44: τοις εχθροις ημων 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald | f om 93a, 106 | g om 249

18 a-b ei L | c εδοξαζομεν 93a | d om 44, 106, 120, 236

19 a om 44, 106 | b tw A | c δουλειας N: ψυχης 93a | d-e αλλ επεθηκαν L (επεθηκας 19, 108b) | f + αυτων επι τας χειρας των ειδωλων N^c. a ms and most cursives: + των ειδωλων N*: + αυτων επι τοις ειδωλοις 44, 106: + αυτων επι τας χειρας των εθνων 52

20 a αυτων L | b om L | c ενφραξη A | d στοματα N 249 | e νμουντων A 93b | f σε L 93b, 44, 52, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 248, C, Ald | g om 106 | h θυσιαστηριον L | i σοι A

21 a στοματα L | b εχθρων L | c πατερων 19, 108b | d σαρκινων 93a | e + τον L

22 a + δη L | b pr a 93b | d + κε N | e-f μισουσι σε εχθροις L: μισουσι 55: εχθροις 93b: μισουσι σε 103a | g-l om 106 | g om 93b, 108a | h γελασάτωσαν A 93b: χαρειθησαν L | i επι L | k om L: και 71 | l βουλας L | m-n απο του λαου σου 71 | m αυτου N* | n αυτοις N* | o + εις κακα L

23 a-25 d om 44, 106 | a-25 h om 71 | a επιφανθι ημιν L | b + και L | d-e μη θρανσης ημας L | f-l om L: et nunc subveni orphanas mihi L (aft vs. 29) | f βασιλευς 249 | g εθνων 74, 76, 120, 236, 243, 248, C | h αρχην N*

24 aft 29 L | a εν ρυομενον 93a: Κυριε συρρυθμον 249 | b + και χαριτωσον τα ρηματα μου L: + et gratiam da in conspectu meo L | c βασιλεως L | d μεταστρεψον L | e αυτων N* | f + παντων 74, 76, 120, 236

νοούντων αὐτῶ·²⁵ ἡμᾶς^a δὲ ῥύσαι^b ἐν^c χειρί σου,^d καὶ βοήθησόν^e 25
μοι^e τῇ^f μόνη καὶ μὴ ἐχούσῃ^g εἰ μὴ σέ, Κύριε.^h πάντωνⁱ γινώσιν
ἔχεις,^j 26 καὶ οἶδας ὅτι ἐμίσησα^a δόξαν ἀνόμων,^b καὶ^c βδελύσσομαι 26
κοίτην^d ἀπεριτμήτων^e καὶ^f παντὸς ἀλλοτρίου.^g 27 σὺ^a οἶδας τὴν^b 27
ἀνάγκην μου,^c ὅτι βδελύσσομαι τὸ σημεῖον τῆς ὑπερηφανίας μου.^d ὃ
ἐστίν ἐπὶ τῆς^e κεφαλῆς μου^f ἐν ἡμέραις^g ὀπτασίας μου.^h βδελύσσο-
μαιⁱ αὐτὸ ὡς ῥάκος καταμηνίων,^j καὶ^k οὐ φορῶ αὐτὸ ἐν ἡμέραις^l
ἡσυχίας μου.^m 28 καὶ^a οὐκ ἔφαγεν^b ἡ^c δούλη^d σου^e τράπεζαν^f 28
Ἀμάν,^g καὶ^h οὐκ ἐδόξασαⁱ συμπόσιον^j βασιλέως,^k οὐδὲ^l ἔπιον οἶνον^m
σπονδῶν.ⁿ 29 καὶ^a οὐκ ὑψώθη^b ἡ^c δούλη σου^d ἀφ'^e ἡμέρας^f μετα- 29
βολῆς μου^g μέχρι^h νῦνⁱ πλὴν^j ἐπὶ^k σοί,^l Κύριε.^m ὃ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ.ⁿ
30 ὁ^a θεὸς ὁ^b ἰσχύων^c ἐπὶ πάντας, εἰσάκουσον φωνὴν^d ἀπηλπισμένων^e 30
καὶ^f ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν πονηρευομένων,^g καὶ^h ῥύσαιⁱ με^j ἐκ^k
τοῦ φόβου μου.^l

24 *g* αυτων 19, 93a

25 a-d om **L** | b ρυσον 19 | c + τη **L** | d + τη κραταια **L** | e ημιν 93a | f-h om **L** | g + βοηθον A 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 249: + βοηθειαν N: + ετερον βοηθον 245, C | h + οτι συ **L** | i παντοκρατορ 108a, 249 | j-i om **L**

26 a-c om **L**: aft e **L** | b ανομου **L** | d-27i om A | e απεριτμητου **L** | f-g om **L** | g αλλογενους **L**

27 aft vs. 29 **L** | a + Κυριε **L** | b-d quoniam ex quo vestimentum hoc **L** | b-c om 44, 106 | dom A **L** | e om 52 | f + και ον φορω αυτο ει μη **L** | f-h om **L** | g ημερα A **L** | i pr και **L** | j καταμηνιων **N** 74, 120, 236: καταμηνιων 44, 106: αποκαθημενης **L** | k-m om **L** | l-m die bona **L** | l ημερα 249

28 a-c *Deus tu nosti quoniam non manducavi* **L** | b εφαγον 108a, 236 | c-d Αμαν | e + επι των **L** | f τραπεζων αυτων **L** **L** | g αμα **L**: excretionum **L** | h-n om 44, 106 | i εδοξαμην 120 | j-k βασιλεως συμποσια **L** | j σάσσυμποσιον 120 | l και ουκ **L** | m-n σπονδης οινον **L**

29 a-g *tu nosti quoniam a via conversationis meae non sum laetata* **L** | b ευφρανθη **N** A **L** 64, 74, 120, 236, 248, 249, C, Ald: ηυφρανθην 93a, 44, 106: εφρανον 108b: ευφρανον 19 | c-d om 44, 106 | e ef **L** Ald: εν 52 | f ημεραις **L** | g om **N*** (**N** c. a has) | h-i om **L** **N** **L**: αχρι νυν 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120: μεχρι του νυν 52, 64, C, Ald: αχρι του νυν 249 | j ει μη **L** | k-l om 44, 106 | l + Κυριε 74, 76, 120 | m-n δεσποτα **L**: Κυριε Κυριε Αβρααμ 236 | Domine **L**

30 a-c om 44, 106 **L** | a-c και νυν δυνατος ων **L** | b om 52, C | d φωνης **N** c. a A **L** 71, 74, 76, 120, 248, C | e αφηλπισμενων **N**: απελπισμενων 52, 64, 19 | f om 44, 106 | g + εφ ημας **L** | h-l om **L** | i εξελου **L** | j + Κυριε **L** | k + χειρος **L** | l ου 44, 71, 106: + transfer luctum nostrum in laetitiam, dolores autem nostros in hilaritatem: surgentes autem supra partem tuam Deus palam facito, aperi Domine; cognoscere Domine **L**

CHAPTER V, AND ADDITION D

V: 1 (=D: 1) יְיָ om יְיָ **I** **S** | יְיָ | + ως επανασατο προσευχο-
μενη (+ Εσθηρ **L**) εξεδυσατο τα ιματια της θεραπειας **L** **L** (93b +): + et
lavavit corpus suum aqua et unxit se unctione **L** | יתלבש **L** και περι-
εβαλετο **L** **L** | יתלבש **L** | + vestimentis **I**: om **G**: + יתלבש **S**: τα ιματια **L**:
vestimento **L** | מלכות **L** την δοξην αυτης **G**: της δοξης **L**: gloriae suae + et
ornata est ornamentis **L**: + the following passage (D: 2-6) in **L** **L**
(93b under -)

- 2 ^aκαὶ^a γεννηθεῖσα^b ἐπιφανής,^c ἐπικαλεσαμένη τὸν^d πάντων ἐπόπτην^e
 3 θεὸν^f καὶ^g σωτήρα,^h παρέλαβενⁱ τὰς^j δύο ἄβρας,^k ³καὶ τῇ μὲν μιᾷ^l
 4 ἐπηρείδeto^a ὡς τρυφερομένη, ⁴ἥ δὲ ἑτέρα ἐπικολούθει κουφίζουσα^a
 5 τὴν^b ἐνδυσιν^c αὐτῆς· ⁵καὶ αὐτὴ ἐρυθρίωσα^a ἄκμῃ^b κάλλους αὐτῆς,
 καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς ἰλαρὸν^c ὡς προσφιλές,^d ἥ δὲ καρδία αὐτῆς
 6 ἀπεστενωμένη^e ἀπὸ^f τοῦ φόβου.^g ⁶καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα πάσας^a τὰς θύρας

2 a-k om 93a | a-c et facta est praecipua^l | b γεννηθῆ N*: γενομένη L | c περιφανής 44: επι-
 φανεις 19, 106: + και L 76 | d των 52 | e γνωστην L | f-g και σωτηρα θεον L: om 71 | f om 243, 248, C |
 g-h om ^l | h σωτερα 52 | i παρελαβετο N: παρελαβε μεθ εαυτης L: pr και 71 | j om N A L | k + αυτης
 44, 71, 74, 76, 120: αυρας αυτης 106

3 ^aεπερειδeto B a 7 b N 71, 76, 106, 108a: επεριδeto A

4 ^aεπικουφίζουσα L: κουφισα N* | b-c το ενδυμα L

5 ^aερυθριουσα N: + εν N c. a L: + ως N* | b + του 108a | c om L: + αυτης N | d + oculi
 autem gratissimi ^l | ^l προφιλεις N* | e απεστενωμένη 52, 93a: αποστενωμένη 106 | f-g om L | g + et
 formidans a domino in terrore mortis, quoniam mors erat ante oculos ejus ^l

6 ^aom L: απασας 108a

1 (= D: 6) [וְהַעֲמִידָהּ] κατεστη ^l | εστη L | [וְהַעֲמִידָהּ — הַמִּלְכָּה] om ^l |
 [בַּחֲזָר — הַפְּנִימִיָּה] om ^l | [נָכַח] ενωπιον ^l L: κατενωπιον 93b N c. a |
 [בֵּית] om ^l | [וְהַמִּלְכָּה] et ille ^l | και αυτος ^l | et invenit Artaxerxem
 regem ^l | ου αυτος 93b | [מַלְכוּתוֹ] om מלכות ^l | 19: gloriae suae ^l |
 [בְּבֵית — הַבֵּית] om ^l | [הַמִּלְכָּה — בְּבֵית] om ^l | + the following
 (D: 6-7) in ^l L ^l

- 6 ^aκαὶ πᾶσαν^b στολὴν^c τῆς^d ἐπιφανείας^e αὐτοῦ^f ἐνεδεδύκει,^g ὅλος^h
 διὰ χρυσοῦⁱ καὶ^j λίθων^k πολυτελῶν,^l καὶ^m ἡνⁿ φοβερὸς^o σφόδρα.^p
 7 ⁷καὶ ἄρας^a τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπωρωμένον^b δόξῃ^c ἐν^d ἄκμῃ^e θυμοῦ^e

6 b-h om 106 | b την A: + την N c. a | a-g et ipse erat vestitus purpura ^l | d om L | e επι-
 φανιας N A | f om L | g ενδυκει B* (ενεδυκει B?): ενεδυκει N c. a A: ενεδιδυσκει N: ενεδεδυσκει
 55: ενεδυκει 93b | h-i om ^l | h ολος 19, 52, 93b | i χρυσος L: χρυσω A: χρυσιου 249 | j-l et omni
 lapide pretioso ^l | k λιθοι L | l πολυτελεις επ αυτω L | m-p et aurea virga in manu ejus ^l | n om
 L | o φοβερωσ 52

7 ^aom N* (N c. a mg has): ηρεν A | a-c et respiciens oculis suis ^l | b + εν L: πεπληρω-
 μενη N*: πεπωρωμενος N c. a | c δοξη 19: + ως ταυρος L + sicut taurus ^l | d om 44, 106 | e +
 αυτου L ^l

2 (= D: 7) [וַיְהִי] om יְהִי ^l | 7: om ^l L | [כְּרָאוֹת] so Ben Asher
 (Ginsburg): כְּרָאוֹת Ben Naphtali B²: εβλεψεν ^l | ενεβλεψεν L (aft
 D: 7^c): om N* A | [הַמִּלְכָּה] om ^l | [אֶת אֶחָד] om ^l | αυτη L: eam
^l | [הַמִּלְכָּה — בַּחֲזָר] om ^l | [בַּחֲזָר] om ^l | + et iratus est ei: et
 cogitabat perdere eam rex, et erat ambiguus clamans, et dixit: Quis
 ausus est introire in aulam non vocatus? ^l | + the following (D: 7) in
^l L ^l

3 om G L \mathfrak{L} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.mg}$ A 44, 71, 93b, 106) | [המלך] om \mathfrak{L} | [מה לך] $\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ L 71: $\tau\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} : *quae est postulatio tua* \mathfrak{L} | [אסתר] *succedanea et consors regni mei* \mathfrak{L} | [המלכה] om \mathfrak{G} L \mathfrak{L} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.}$, 93b under *) | [ובמה בקשתך] *αναγγελιον μοι* L | [וינתן] $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ \mathfrak{G} : $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\omega\iota\eta\sigma\omega$ L: *et faciam* \mathfrak{L}

4 [אסתר] *illa* \mathfrak{I} : *regina* \mathfrak{L} : + $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ \mathfrak{G} : $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ L (\mathfrak{L} om) | [טוב — אם] *postulatio mea rex* \mathfrak{L} : + *obsecro* \mathfrak{I} | [היום] a few codd | [המלך] om \mathfrak{I} : $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} : \omicron $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mathfrak{N}^{a.c.mg}$ A 108a, 52, 243, C, Ald, 64, 93b: $\sigma\upsilon$ L \mathfrak{L} | [והמין] + \omicron $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ L: + *amicus tuus* \mathfrak{L} | [היום] om K 101, 158, 180, R 562, 593, 667, 850, \mathfrak{S} : $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ L: *cras* \mathfrak{L} | [לך] *ad me* \mathfrak{I} : om \mathfrak{G} L: *apud me* \mathfrak{L}

5 [ויאמר] + *statim* \mathfrak{I} | [מהרו] סָה־ \mathfrak{S} : om \mathfrak{L} | [את המין] om \mathfrak{L} | [את דבר] וְאָמַרְתִּי | [אסתר] *reginae* \mathfrak{L} | [ויבא] — end of vs. 8 | om \mathfrak{L} | [עשתה] $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$ \mathfrak{G} | [המלך והמין] $\alpha\mu\phi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota$ \mathfrak{G} L | [אסתר — אשר] om \mathfrak{S} | [אסתר] *eis regina* \mathfrak{I} : + *δειπνον πολυτελες* L (93b under +): om 249

6 om \mathfrak{L} | [לאסתר] *ei* \mathfrak{I} : om 44, 106 | [בנישחה] *postquam biberat abundanter* \mathfrak{I} : om L | [היין] om \mathfrak{G} L (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.mg}$, 93b under *) | [מה] + $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha$ $\epsilon\omicron\sigma\theta\eta\rho$ \mathfrak{G} : + $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ $\sigma\omicron\iota$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha$ $\epsilon\omicron\sigma\theta\eta\rho$ 52, 64, 74, 106, 120, 243, 248, C, Ald: + η $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha$ L: + $\sigma\omicron\iota$ $\epsilon\omicron\sigma\theta\eta\rho$ 44 | [שאלתך] om \mathfrak{G} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.mg}$, 93b under *) | [המלכות — וינתן] om \mathfrak{G} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.mg}$, 93b under *) | [ובמה בקשתך] om L: om \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{S} | [איתשאי] L (και $\tau\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\zeta\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ 93a) | [ותעש] $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\sigma\omicron\iota$) $\omicron\sigma\alpha$ $\alpha\zeta\iota\omega\iota\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} L: וַיַּעַשׂ \mathfrak{S}

7 om \mathfrak{L} | [אסתר] om \mathfrak{G} (exc A 44, 93b, 106) | [ותאמר] om \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{G} L | [ובקשתיה] + *sunt istae* \mathfrak{I} : $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\zeta\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ \mathfrak{G} (+ $\mu\omicron\nu$ \mathfrak{N} A N L 71, 74, 76, 93, 243, 248, C, Ald): om 44, 106

8 om \mathfrak{L} | [בעיני] وَبَيْنَ \mathfrak{S} : $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu$ \mathfrak{G} : $\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ A L | [המלך] $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ L | [אם — בקשתיה] om \mathfrak{G} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{a.c.mg inf}$, 93b *) | [על] وَعَلَى \mathfrak{S} | [לחת] وَلَحْظָה \mathfrak{S} | [ולעשות] وَفَعَلْتُ \mathfrak{S} | [ויבא] + \omicron $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\nu$ 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | [והמין] + $\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ \mathfrak{G} : + $\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ A 52, 64, 248, C, Ald: + $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\eta$ $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ L | [ומהרו] om \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{S} | [אעשה] om \mathfrak{S} | [כדבר] $\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ \mathfrak{G} : $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ L: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | [המלך] om \mathfrak{G} L: + $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$ \omicron $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\omega\iota\eta\sigma\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\omicron$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ L

9 [ויצא המין] $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ L 93b ÷: om \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{L} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.mg}$, 93b under *) | [שמה] $\nu\pi\epsilon\rho\chi\alpha\rho\eta\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} : $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\theta\alpha\nu\mu\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ L, 93b ÷: om \mathfrak{L} : + $\alpha\pi\omicron$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} (exc 93b): + *a coena* \mathfrak{L} : + $\kappa\alpha\iota$ \omicron $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ L, 93b ÷ | [וטוב] $\epsilon\nu\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ \mathfrak{G} : $\eta\sigma\nu\chi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ L: om L | [לב] om \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{L} (exc $\mathfrak{N}^{c.a.}$, 93b under *) | [וכראות] — end of vs | *et trecenti viri cum eo, et omnes adoraverunt eum: Mardochaeus autem non adoravit eum* \mathfrak{L} : om L | [מרדכי] + *sedentem* \mathfrak{I} : + וַיֵּשֶׁב \mathfrak{S} : + $\tau\omicron\nu$ יֹהָנָן

δαιον ⑤ | [בשער] *εν τη αυλη* ⑤ | [המלך — במינו] om ⑤ (exc ④ c. a. mg^{sup}, 93b under *) | [המלך] *palatii* ③ | [במינו] *de loco sessionis suae* ③ | על [המלך] om ⑤ (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *: A has *Αμιν*)

10 [ויתאפק] om ⑤ L ② (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *) | [המלך] om ⑤ (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *) | [ביתו] + *tristis* ② | [ורישלה] om ⑤ ② L (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *) | [ויבא] + *ad se* ③ | [אהביו] *τους φιλους* ⑤ (+ *αυτου* L ②): + *και τους υιους αυτου* L | [זרש] *Zares* ③: ① ② ③: *Zosarav* ⑤ L: *Σωσαραν* A: *Zaparsan* (Γαζασαν, Γαζαγαν) Jos. xi, § 245: *Zosarra* (Gozarra) ②: *Zorav* 93b

11 om L | [המלך] om ③ ⑤ (exc ④ c. a.) ② | [את כבוד] om ⑤ (exc 93b) | [ורב בניו] om ⑤ ② (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *) | [ואת — end of vs] om ② | [את כל] om ③ | כל *δοξαν* ⑤: *παντα* 93b | [גדלו] *αυτω περιεθηκεν* ⑤: om ③ | [את אשר²] om ③ ③ | [על השרים] om ⑤ | [על] + כל K 117, 252, R 379, ① ② ③ | [ועבדו המלך] *και ηγεισθαι της βασιλειας* ⑤ | [המלך] *suos* ③

12 [ויאמר המלך] *και εκαυχατο λεγων* L: *et gloriabatur dicens* ② | [המלך] om ③ | [אך] *post haec* ③: *ως* L: om ⑤ ② | [אחחר] om ⑤ L ② (④ c. a. A 93b have) | [המלכה] *rex* ②: om ③ | [עם — עשתה] om ② | [עם] *ει μη* L | אל — [עשתה] *εν επισημω ημερα αυτης* L: om ③ | [אשר עשתה] om ③ ⑤ (exc ④ c. a.): *αυτης* 74, 76 | [כי אם אותי] *και εμε μονον* L | [וגם] *regina autem nullius mentionem fecit, nisi mei: et ego sum necessarius tuus inter omnes amicos ejus, sedile autem meum supra omnes, et ab omnibus adoratur* ② | [גם] om ⑤ L | [לה עם המלך] om ⑤ L (exc ④ c. a. mg, 93b under *)

13 [וכל] om ⑤ L (② has) | [לי — זה] *τουτο δε λυπει με μονον* L | [יורשב] *οταν* ⑤ L ②: *εν παντι χρονω οταν* ④ c. a. mg, 93b under * | [בכל עת אשר] om ⑤ L ② (exc ④ c. a., 93b under *) | [בשער] *εν τη αυλη* ⑤ L: om ② | [המלך] om ⑤ (exc ④ c. a., 93b under *) ②: + *και μη προσκυνει με* L: + *non adorantem me* ②

14 [זרש] cf. 5: 10: *Gossara* ② (Pech.) | [וכל] om כל ⑤ L ② (exc ④ c. a., 93b under *): *ceteri* ③ | [אהביו] *οι φιλοι* (+ *αυτου* ④ c. a., 93b under *): om L: + *εκ γενους Ιουδαιων εστιν. επει συγκεχωρηκε σε ο βασιλευς αφανισαι τους Ιουδαιους, και εδωκαν σοι οι θεοι εις εκδικησιν αυτων ημεραν ολεθριον* L | [יעשרו] *κοπητω σοι* ⑤ L ② (om *σοι* A 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 236) | [גבהה] om ⑤ L ② (exc ④ c. a. mg) | [אמה] *pelum* ②: + *και κεισθω* L | [בבקר] *tr aft* | [למלך — בבקר] om ②: + *αυτω* L | [ויתלו] *ut appendatur* ③: *και κρεμασθητω* ⑤ ②: *και κρεμασον* L | [את מירדכי] *αυτον* L | [עליו] *επι τον ξυλον* ⑤ L: *in eo* ② | [המלך — רבא] om ② | [עם] *pros* L | [המשחה] om L | [אל המשחה] om L | [לפני] *some* | [שמיח] *και ευφραινον* ⑤ (om *και* L) | [הדבר] om L | [בניי] *some* | [עוד] *codd* ③ | [המלך] *ei* ③: + ① ② ③: *ויעש העץ* *και εποησεν ουτως* L

CHAPTER VI

VI, 1 [נדרה שנת המלך] ο δε Kyrios απεστησεν τον υπνον απο του βασι-
 λεως G: ο δε δυνατος απεστησε τον υπνον του βασιλεως και ην αγρυπνων L:
Judaeorum autem Deus et universae creaturae Dominus percussit
regem vigilantia L^P (L^C om 6:1) | [ויאמר] και ειπεν τω διδασκαλω αυτου G:
 και εκληθησαν οι αναγνωστα L: *et dixit rex* L | [להביא] + sibi J: εισφερειν
 G: εισφερων A: *legite mihi* L: om L | [אח ספר] γραμματα G: και το βιβλιον
 L: *librum* L | [הזכרנות — המלך] *et oculi mei somnum capiant et ex-*
tendit lector manum suam in bibliotheca L^P | [דברי] om G L (exc N^{C, A},
 93b under *) | [הימים] om L | [ויהיו נקראים] αναγιγνωσκειν G: αναγιγνωσκετο
 L | [לפני המלך] αυτω G L: αυτα ενωπιον του βασιλεως N^{C, A}, 93b under *

2 [ויביצא כתוב] *ventum est ad illum locum ubi scriptum est* J: ευρεν
 δε τα γραμματα τα γραφεντα G: και ην υποθεσις L: *Judaeorum autem Deus*
gubernavit manum lectoris ad librum quem scripserat rex memo-
riam facere Mardochaeo L | [הגיד] εποιησε ευεργετημα L: *liberavit eum*
 L | [בירדני] *de periculis* L: + τω βασιλει G L | [על] *insidias* J: om L |
 [בַּגְתָּא] cf. 2: 21: *Bagathan* J: [הַסֵּף] S: *Hastageo (Bastageo)* L: om
 L G (exc N^{C, A mg}, 93b under *) | [ותִּישׁ] *et Thares* J: [תִּישׁ] S: *et Thedeste*
 (Thedeste) L: om G L (exc N^{C, A mg}, 93b under *) | [שני] om J L | [המלך]
 αυτου A: om J L L 44, 106 | [בשמרי הסף] εν τω φυλασσειν αυτους G: om
 J L L | [הסה] [אשר] — end of vs] om L | [אשר בקשו] και ζητησαι
 G | [במלך] om L G (exc 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236) | [אהשוורש] + *quod*
cum audisset J: *eum + et legit lector benefactum Mardochaei et com-*
memoratus L

3 om L | [המלך] + τοις διακονοις αυτου 44, 71, 74, 76, 93b, 120, 236 |
 [בזה] *die nondum* L | [יקר וגדולה] om L | [לבירדני] *huic homini* L |
 [על זה] om G (exc N^{C, A}, 93b under *): *secundum quod fecit nobis* L |
 [וי אמרו] + ei J: + ח S | [ויאמרו] — end of vs] om L | [משרתיו] om G
 (exc 93b): *pr ac* J S | [לֹא- לֹא] Ba | [נעשה] εποιησας G | [דבר] + και
 επεστησεν ο βασιλευς τον νουν σφοδρα, λεγων πιστος ανηρ Μαρδοχαιος εις παρα-
 φυλακην της ψυχης μου, δι οτι αυτος εποιησε με ζην αχρι του νυν, και καθημαι
 σημερον επι του θρονου μου, και ουκ εποιησα αυτω ουθεν· ουκ ορθως εποιησα.
 και ειπεν ο βασιλευς τοις παισιν αυτου τι ποιησομεν τω Μαρδοχαιω τω σωτηρι
 των λογων; και νοησαντες οι νεανισκοι διεφθονουν αυτω· ενεκειτο γαρ φοβος
 Αμαν εν τοις σπλαγχνοις αυτων. και ενενοησεν ο βασιλευς. και εγενετο ορθρος
 L: + εν δε το πυνθανεσθαι τον βασιλεια περι της ευνοιας (+ του N 71, 74, 76,
 108a) Μαρδοχαιου (περι-Μαρδ. om 93b: ταυτα 44, 106) ιδου Αμαν (+ εισηλθεν
 N^{C, A mg}, 93b) εν τη αυλη (εις την αυλην N^{C, A mg}, 93b *) (+ οικου του βασιλεως την
 εξωτεραν N^{C, A mg}, 93b under *) G: + *vigilavit autem Aman in regia regis,*
et trecenti viri cum eo L

4 [ויאמר] *pr statim* J | [בחצר] εστιν εξω L | [והבין] — end of vs] aft
 6: 5 L | [בא] ην L | [לחצר] — [החיצונה] om G: Αμαν δε ωρθρκει L: *ad*

regem et cogitabat 𐤀 | [החיצונה] *interius* 𐤅 | [למלך] + *et juberet* 𐤅 | על — לו] om L | לו] om 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) : + *et non eum permisit Dominus loqui* 𐤀

5 [בהצר — ויאמרו] om L | [אליו] om 𐤅 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) | [הנה] om 𐤅 𐤀 | [עמד בחצר] om 𐤀

6 [לוי המלך] om 𐤅 L | [המך] om 𐤅 𐤀 𐤀 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg} 93b) | [ויבוא המך] om 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg} 93b) | [המלך] R 593: ο βασιλεὺς τῷ Ἀμαν 𐤄 𐤀 | [מה] 𐤀 | [לעשות] 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 | [באיש] + τῷ τὸν βασιλεῖα τιμῶντι L: + *qui regem honorificat* 𐤀 | [ביקרו] — אשר] om 𐤀 𐤀 | [למך] 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 | [בבלבו] + *et reputans* 𐤅: λεγὼν L: *cum cogitatione sua* 𐤀 | [יקר — יחפץ] *neminem* 𐤀 | *habet rex necessarium* 𐤀

7 [המך] om 𐤅 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a} 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 93b) | [אל המלך] *domine rex* 𐤀: om 𐤅 L 44, 106 | [איש] 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄: *honorificanti regem* 𐤀 | [ביקרו] — אשר] om 𐤀

8 [ריבאו] *ενεγκατωσαν οι παιδες τον βασιλεως* 𐤄 (ενεγκατω A): *ληφθητω* L: *accipiat* 𐤀 | [בלכות] *βυσσινην* 𐤄 | [המלך] — אשר] om 𐤅 L 𐤀 | [בו] om 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) | [המלך] + *et corona aurea* 𐤀 | [וסוס] *et imponi super equum; et equo regali vehatur* 𐤀: και ιππος βασιλικος L | [המלך] — אשר] om 𐤀 𐤀: *qui de sella regis est* 𐤅 | [עליו] om L 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) | [בראשו] — ואשר] om L 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) : *indutus quae supra dixi* 𐤀: *et accipere regium diadema super caput suum* 𐤅

9 [ונתון] και λαβητω ταυτα L: om נתון 𐤀 | [יד — הלבוש] om 𐤀 L 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg}, 93b under *) | [הלבוש] om 𐤅 | [איש] *primus* 𐤅: εν 𐤄: εις L: *unus* 𐤀 | [הסוס — הפרתמים] om 𐤀 | [ביקרו] — והלבשו] om 𐤅 | [אשר] — [בברו] om L 44, 106 | [הסוס על הסוס] *et incedens* 𐤅 | [העיר] 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄: *δια της πλατειας* 𐤄: *in tota* 𐤀: και περιελθετο L | [וקראו] *κηρυσσετω* 𐤄 (κηρυσσετωσαν 𐤁^{c. a}) *κηρυσσω* L: *praedicet* 𐤀 | [לפניו] λεγὼν 𐤄: *et dicat* 𐤅 | [לאיש] παντι ανθρωπω G: *omni* + *honorificanti regem* 𐤀: τῷ τὸν βασιλεῖα τιμῶντι L | [ביקרו] — אשר] om 𐤀

10 [להמך] *ei* 𐤅: om 44, 71, 106 | [הסוס — מהר] om 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a mg inf}, 93b under *) | [הסוס — קח] om 𐤀 | [את הסוס] *pr* 𐤀 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄: *καλως* 𐤄: *bene* 𐤀 | [ועשה] om 𐤅 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄 | [כן] *sicut dixisti* 𐤀 | [היהודי] om 𐤀 | [בשער] τῷ θεραπευοντι εν τη αυλῃ 𐤄 𐤄: *ον δοξαζει* 106 | [דברי] + *δουλη* 249: *ον ειπεν* A | [המלך] *palatii* 𐤅: om L 𐤄 𐤄 (exc A 106) | [בכל] om L 𐤄 𐤄 (exc 𐤁^{c. a}, 93b under *) | [אשר דברת] om L: + *ως δε εγνων Ἀμαν οτι ουκ ην αυτος ο δοξαζομενος, αλλ οτι Μαρδοχαιος, συνετριβη η καρδια αυτου σφοδρα, και μετεβαλε το πνευμα αυτου εν εκλυσει*. L: + *et doluit Aman in his verbis, et accepit Aman omnia haec et dedit Mardochaeo, et dixit ei, Surge serve Dei, et esto honorificatus* 𐤀

11 [הסוס] pr כִּנְיָ S: + εντρεπομενος τον Μαρδοχαιον καθ οτι εκεινε τη ημερα εκεκρικει ανασκολοπισαι αυτον. και ειπε τω Μαρδοχαιω Περιελου τον σακκον. και εταραχθη Μαρδοχαιος ως αποθνησκων, και απεδυστατο μετ οδυνης τον σακκον L | וַיִּלְבַּשׁ אֶת מְדוּכָה | και ενεδυστατο τα ιματια δοξης + και εδοκει Μαρδοχαιος τερας θεωρειν, και η καρδια αυτου προς τον κυριον. και εξιστατο εν αφασια. και εσπευσεν Αμαν L | וַיִּרְכִּיבֵהוּ סוּסִים S + עַל סוּסִים K 118, 202; R 486: + equo praecedebat J: + επι τον ιππον G L: + εφιππον L | בִּרְחוֹב הַיָּרֵיר | και εξηγαγεν Αμαν τον ιππον εξω + και προσηγαγεν αυτον εξω L: pr και δηλθεν G L | לִפְנֵי | λεγων G L: om J L | לְאַשׁ | παντι ανθρωπω G L: τω ανδρι τω τον βασιλεια τιμωντι L, 93b ÷ | בִּיקְרִי | + et ibat Aman in infamiam sibi, et Mardochaeus honorificatus valde; et Deus confregit cor Aman L

12 וַיִּשָּׁב | [המלך] aft אַבֵּל L | [אֶל שַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ] eis τον οικον αυτου L: eis την αυλην G (+ του βασιλεως N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *, L) | [המלך] palatii J | [וְהַפִּיר רֹאשׁ] κατα κεφαλης G (κατακεκαλυμμενος (την) κεφαλην N^{c. a}, 93b *): et percusso corde L: om L

13 [וַיִּסְפֹּר] misit et narravit L | [הַמֶּן] om J L | [לְזָרֵשׁ] cf. 5:10: om L | [וְלִכְלֹל אֶהְבִּיר] om S L: om כל J G L | כל² om G (exc 93b) | [לִי] om L: Αμαν N | [הַכְּבִיר] + quos habebat in consilio J: וְסֻבְחָה S: οι φιλοι G L (+ αυτου N^{c. a}, 93b under *) | [וְזָרֵשׁ] om זָרֵשׁ J L L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | [אַשְׁתּוֹ] η γυνη G (+ αυτου N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | [אִם — מְדוּכָה] om L | אֲשֶׁר — end of vs | αφ οτε λαλεις περι αυτου κακα, προσπορευεται σοι τα κακα · ησυχαζε L | [אַשֶׁר] om G L | [לִי כִי] N¹ a few codd: וְסֻבְחָה S: αυτον αμνασθαι G L | [לִפְנֵי] om נִפְלָה N¹ a few codd: וְסֻבְחָה S | [נִפְּוֹל חֲפֹל] om L | [נִפְּוֹל חֲפֹל] N¹ a few codd: וְסֻבְחָה S | [וְסֻבְחָה] om G L L + οτι θεος ζων μετ αυτου G (93b ÷): + οτι ο θεος εν αυτοις L: + quia jam propheta est L

14 [וַיִּסְרִי] [וְסֻבְחָה] S: om J L L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 249, 93b under *) | [וְסֻבְחָה] S: τις L | [הַמֶּלֶךְ] reginae L: om L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236, 249) | [הַגִּיעִיר] παρην L | [לְהַבִּיאַ] om S L L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | [הַמֶּן] eum J L | [אַשֶׁר — אֶסְתֵּר] και οὕτως ιλαρωθη L | [אַסְתֵּר] regina J: + η βασιλισσα 71, 74, 76, 120, 236

CHAPTER VII

VII, 1 [לְשַׁחֲתוֹת] και πορευθεις ανεπεσε εν ωρα L | [לְשַׁחֲתוֹת] S: ad coenam L | [עַם] S: [אַסְתֵּר] om J L L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | [הַמֶּלֶכָה] eo L: αυτων L

2 [וַיֵּאמֶר] pr factum est L | [לְאַסְתֵּר] ei J: + reginam L: om A | [גַּם] ως δε προηγεν η προποσις L | [גַּם] om L G (exc N^{c. a}, 93b under *) | [בְּיוֹם] om 44 L | [הַשְּׁנִי] S: [בְּמִשְׁתָּה] postquam incaluerat J: ? for ב S: in bona propinatione L | [הַיָּרִיךְ] om L L G (exc N^{c. a}, 93b under *): + τι εστιν και G (τι εστι σοι και 71, 74, 76, 106, 120: τι εσται σοι και 44: 93b omi) | [שְׂאֵלְתָךְ] ο κινδυνος L | [אַסְתֵּר — לֵךְ] om S L L | [הַמֶּלֶכָה] om J 44, 106 | [וְתַתֵּן לָךְ] om G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | [וְמִה] om

7 בהמתו L: εκθυμος δε γενομενος L: om L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | מִן־מִשְׁחָה הָיָה de loco suo + projiciens mappham L: de loco convivii I: και πληθεισ οργης L: + et intravit I: + וַיֵּצֵא S: + και ην περιπατων L: + et exiit L | גִּנַּת הַבֵּיתָן hortum arboribus consitum I: τον κηπον G (+ τον συμφυτον N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *): hortum L: om L | וְהָמֵן — end of vs] om L | עֲמִיד om L G (exc N^{c. a.}, 93b under * 249): παρεκαλει 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald: לִבְקֶשׁ | παρητειτο G: και ητειτο 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald: παρεκαλει 55, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | עַל־נֶפֶשׁ om L G (exc N^{c. a.}, 93b under *, 249) | מִי־אֶחָד om L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | בִּי־כֹלָתָה om L G | אֲלֵיוֹ הִרְעָה | εαυτον εν κακοις οντα G L | מִמֶּלֶךְ om L G (exc N^{c. a.}, 93b under *)

8 והמלך — יין tr aft עליה L | והמלך qui cum I | מִגִּנַּת om L | הַבֵּיתָן nemoribus consito + et intrasset I: om L L G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | אֵל — הָיָה ad locum suum L: om G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | וְהָמֵן reperit Aman I: + εταραχθη και L | נֶפֶל + επι τους ποδας Εσθηρ της βασιλισσης L | אִשָּׁר — עֲלִיָּה αξιων την βασιλισσαν G: reginae et deprecabatur eam tenens L: ετι ανακειμενης L | אֶחָד + וְהָמֵן S | עֲלִיָּה + videns autem eum in thoro Hesteris iratus est L: + και ιδων L | הַמֶּלֶךְ + ουχ ικανον σοι η αμαρτια της βασιλειας L: + non sufficit quoniam super me et regnum meum manus ausus fuit mittere L | עֲמִי om L L G (μετ εμου N^{c. a. mg}) | בְּבֵית | ενωπιον μου L: om L | חֶפֶז — הָדָר | απαχθητω Αμαν και μη ζητω και ουτως απηγετο L: om L: Αμαν δε ακουσας διετραπη τω προσωπω G (pr ο λογος εξηλθεν εκ του στοματος του βασιλεως N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *)

9 וְהָרִבּוּהָ S: Βουγαθαν G: Βουγαζαν N^{c. a.}: Βουθαθαν N: Βουγαθα N * 71: Βουγαδαν 64: Γαβουθας 93a: Βουχαθαν 236: Αγαθας L: Αβουχαδας (Σαβουχαδας) Jos xi, § 261, 266: Buzatus (Baguas) L: Αρβωνα 93b: Χαρβωνα C: cf. 1:10 | הַסְרִיִּסִּים + qui stabant I: + וַיִּשְׁלַח S: των παιδων αυτου L: + ουτος δε εγνωκει τουτο το ξυλον ιδων του σταυρου εν τη οικια του Αμαν· οτε εκαλει αυτον επι το δειπνον των βασιλεων· και περι τουτου πυθομενος εγνω παρ ενος των παιδων το κατασκευαζομενον 52, 64, 243 (exc ειδων, τον δειπνον), 248 (+ και ειπε), C, Ald | לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ προς τον βασιλεα G: του βασιλεως A: regis L: om L | גַּם | και G: Domine rex L: om I L | אִשָּׁר — הַמֶּלֶךְ tr aft אִמָּה L | אִשָּׁר om S G | הָמֵן om I: + וַיִּשְׁלַח S: + ινα κρεμαση L: + ut illum suspenderet L | לְמִרְדָּכִי τον Μαρδοχαιον L: + וַיִּשְׁלַח S | אִשָּׁר — הָמֵן om L | אִשָּׁר → וַיִּשְׁלַח S | טוב om I G (exc N^{c. a. mg}, 93b under *) | עֲמִיד pr και G S: om L 44, 106 | בְּבֵית הָמֵן | εν τη αυλη αυτου L: om 44, 106 | גְּבוּהָ S Br: ξυλον G (pr υψηλον N^{c. a.}, 93b) om A L: erectum L | אִמָּה | pedium L: + κελυσσον ουν, κυριε, επ αυτω αυτον κρεμασθηναι L | עֲלִיוֹ + et uxor ejus et decem filii ejus L

10 om L | וַיִּתְּלוּ — הָמֵן | και εκρεμασθη Αμαν G: et suspensi sunt sicut praeceperat rex L | לְמִרְדָּכִי + τω λαλησαντι περι του βασιλεως 249

CHAPTER VIII

VIII, 1 ביום — היהודיים] om L | אחשורוש] om 44, 71, 106 | המלכה] om G (exc 93b under *) | צרר — המלך²] om L | היהודיים] om G (exc 93b under *) | ומרדכי — היהודים Q: om G (exc 93b under *) | ומרדכי] L: και Μαρδοχαιος προσεκληθη υπο του βασιλεως G | ליה — כי] om L | הגידה אסתר] *cognoverat rex* L: + τω βασιλει 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 236 | מזה הוא לה] *οτι ενοικειωται αυτη* G (+ Μαρδοχαιος 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236): *quod Mar-dochaeus erat de genere reginae* L: *quod esset patruus suus* J

2 [טבעתו] + מעל ידו K 18, 95; R 42, 405: + *απο της χειρος αυτου* L | [מהמן — אשר] om L | [העביר] + *rex* L | [מהמן] + και εσφραγισθη εν αυτω ο βιος αυτου. και ειπεν ο βασιλευς τη Εσθηρ Και Μαρδοχαιον εβουλευσατο κρεμασαι τον σωσαντα με εκ χειρος των εννουχων; ουκ ηδει οτι πατρων αυτου γένος εστιν η Εσθηρ; L | [וריתנה למרדכי] om L | ותשם — ומרדכי] και εχαρισατο αυτω L | [המן] *suam* J: + και ειπεν αυτω τι θελεις; και ποιησω σοι L

3 om L 106 | [אסתר] om L G (exc 93b under *, 71, 74, 76, 120, 236) | [המלך] *eum* J | [ותבך] *ἑαυτοῦ* S: και ἡξιον G: ותבך — [מהשבתו] om L | [ותחתהן] om G (exc 93b under *) | [האנגי] om G (exc 93b under *) | [מהשבתו] + *pessimas* J: om G (exc 93b under *) | [אשר השב] *de quo impetraverat Aman adversus genus* L: + *συμψασι* 93b +

4 om L | [ויושט] + *manu* J | [המלך] *ille ex more* J | [לאסתר] om J 44 | [שִׁרְבֶּט שִׁרְבֶּט] Ba: שרביט Var Or (Ginsburg) N¹ S | [הזהב] + *quo signum clementiae monstrabatur* J: + η ην εν χειρι αυτου 93b under + | [ותקם] *ἑαυτοῦ* S | [אסתר] *illa* J: om 106 | [המלך²] *eum* J

5 [ותאמרי] και ειπε(ν) G L L: + אסתר K 117 G: + Μαρδοχαιος L: + *regi* L | [יכתב — אם] om L | [המלך¹] *σοι* G: κυριω μου τω βασιλει 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: *domino meo* L | [ואם — לפניו] *tr aft* [המלך²] S | [ואם] om L G (exc 44, 106, 108a, 93b) | [לפניו] om G: *ενωπιον σου* N^{c. a. mg.} A 44, 249, 108a, 93b under *: *εν οφθαλμοις σου* N: *in conspectu tuo* L: *in oculis ejus* J | [וכשר — בעיניו] om G L (exc 93b under *) | [המלך²] *ei* J | [וטובה אני בעיניו] om J S | [יכתב] *obsecro ut novis epistolis* J: *ἑαυτοῦ* S: *πεμφθητω* G: *mittantur a te litterae* L | [להשיב] *αποστραφηναι* G: *αποστρεψαι* A: *οπως ανελης* L | [הספרים] *την επιστολην* L | [מהשבת] *veteres* J: *pr o* S: *τα απεσταλμενα* G: om L L | [האנגי — בן] om J L L G (exc 93b under *) | [אשר — end of vs] om L | [לאבד] *perire* J | [את] + כל many codd (KR) S¹ T¹ L | [היהודים] *eos* J | [בכל מדינות המלך] *εν τη βασιλεια σου* G: *in regia tua in nomine tuo* L

6 om L 106 | [אשר ימצא] om G L (exc 93b *): *et interfectionem* J | [ימצא — תמצא] K 245 R 196, *Sébhîr* in some codd | [ואיכנה] — [מולדתי]

om 3 | וִירָאִיתִי² | σωθῆναι 6: liberari 11 | מוֹלַדְתִּי | sola 11 | de patria mea 11

7 | וַיִּאֲמֵר — הַיְהוּדִי | om L | אֲחֵשׁוּרֻשׁ | so Oc (Ginsburg): אֲחֵשׁוּרֻשׁ | Or N¹ S Br B¹: om 6 11 | לְאַסְתֵּר | illi 11: om 44, 106 | הַמַּלְכָּה — הַיְהוּדִי | om 6 11 (exc 93b under *): τῇ βασιλισσῇ A 5 | הֵנָּה — לְאַסְתֵּר | και ενεχειρισεν αυτω ο βασιλευς τα κατα την βασιλειαν L | הֵנָּה | om 3 11 | בֵּית | παντα τα υπαρχοντα 6: omnes facultates 11 | לְאַסְתֵּר | και ευχαρισαμην σοι 6: tibi 11 5 | וְאֵת — בֵּיהוּדִי | om L | תָּלוּ | jussi affigi 3: εκρεμασα 6: suspendi 11: הָעֵץ | + cum omni domo sua 11 | עַל אִשֶּׁר | + ausus est 3 | שָׁלַח — בֵּיהוּדִי | cogitavit super me mala inferre regno meo 11 | בֵּיהוּדִי | Q: + τι επι επιζητης 6 (93b under +) | + και ειπεν Εσθηρ τω βασιλει τη εξης Δος μοι κολασαι τους εχθρους μου φονω. ενετυχε δε η βασιλισσα Εσθηρ και κατα τεκνων Αμαν τω βασιλει, οπως αποθανωσι και αυτοι μετα του πατρος αυτων. και ειπεν ο βασιλευς Γινεσθω. και επαταξε τους εχθρους εις πληθος. εν δε Σουσους ανθρωμολογησατο ο βασιλευς τη βασιλισση αποκτανθηναι ανδρας, και ειπεν Ιδου διδωμι σοι τον κρεμασαι. και εγενετο ουντως L

8-13 tr aft vs 14 L | וְאַתָּה | και ο βασιλευς ενεχειρισε τω Μαρδοχαιω L: om אַתָּה 11 | כְּתָבוּ | γραφειν L: scribe 11: om 5 | עַל הַיְהוּדִים | om 6 L 11 | כְּטוֹב בְּעֵינֵינוּ | ως δοκει υμιν 6: οσα βουλεται L: quemadmodum tibi placet et Mardochaeo 11 | בָּשָׂם — end of vs | om L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | μου 6 (exc 93b) | וְחַתְמוּ | om 1 5 | הַמֶּלֶךְ² | meo + haec enim consuetudo erat 3: μου 6 11 | כִּי | 5 | אִשֶּׁר נִכְתָּב | οσα γραφεται 6: quaecunque scribuntur 11 | נִכְתָּב | mittebantur 3 | בָּשָׂם הַמֶּלֶךְ | επιταξαντος του βασιλεως 6 11 | הַמֶּלֶךְ¹ | illius 3: μου 6 11 | אֵין | pr ? 5 | לְהַשִּׁיב | [αυτοις αντειπειν 6 11

9 | וַיִּקְרָא — כָּל אִשֶּׁר | om L | סִפְרוּ | + et librariis 3 | הַמֶּלֶךְ — erat | om 6 (exc 8 c. a. mg, 93b under *): regis 11 | הַיְהוּדִי | erat autem tempus 3 | הַשְּׁלִישִׁי | τω πρωτω 6 11 (τριτω 8 c. a. mg, 93b) | הַדֵּשׁ | om 5 6 11 | סִיבָן | Sibani 3: سيبان 5: Νισα(ν) 6 (Σιοναν 8 c. a. mg, 93b): om 11 | בְּשִׁלּוּשָׁה | εν τεταρτη 249 | יַעֲשִׂי | om 11 | בּוֹ | του αυτου ετους 6: του δευτερου ετους 8 *: του αυτου μηνος A N 76: ipsius mensis 11: + سِبْ | 5 | וַיִּכְתֹּב | 5 | צוּהָ | 5: επεστειλε δε L | מִרְדֵּכָי | om 11 6 (exc 8 c. a. mg) | Μαρδοχαιος δια γραμμάτων L: Εσθηρ 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: om 11 | אֵל — end of vs | om L | אֵל | 5 | וְאֵל | om 1 5 | הָאֲחֵשְׁדֵּרפָּנִים | principes 3: اَشْدَرَفَان 5: τοις οικονομοις 6: actoribus 11 | וְשָׂרֵי | + qui praesidebant 3: των σατραπων 11 6 | הַמְּדִינֹת | om 6 11 | אִשֶּׁר | om 5 11 6 (exc 8 c. a. mg 93b) | כּוֹשׁ | + several codd K and R | מְדִינָה¹ | satrapis 11 | כְּתִיבָה | gentium imperantibus 11 | כַּתָּבָה | 2 | מְדִינָה וּמְדִינָה | 2 | κατὰ την εαυτων λεξιν 6: secundum 11 | וְעַם וְעַם כָּלִשְׁנוּ | gentem et gentem secundum uniuscujusque eorum linguam 11: om 6 (exc 93b under *) | וְאֵל — et Judaeis prout legere poterant et audire 3: om 11 6 (exc 93b under *)

- 2 τὰ ἡμέτερα φρονούσι^ο χαίρειν.^p ²πολλοὶ τῇ^a πλείστη τῶν εὐεργε-
τούντων χρηστότητι^b πυκνότερον^ο τιμώμενοι^d μείζον^ο ἐφρόνησαν,^f
3 ³καὶ^a οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους ἡμῖν ζητοῦσι^b κακοποιεῖν, τὸν τε^ο
κόρον^d οὐ δυνάμενοι φέρειν καὶ τοῖς ἐαυτῶν^ο εὐεργέταις ἐπιχειροῦσι^f
4 μηχανᾶσθαι.^ς ⁴καὶ^a τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἀνταναίρουντες,^b ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀπειραγάθων^ο κόμποις^d ἐπαρ-
θέντες,^c τοῦ^f τὰς πάντα κατοπτεύοντος^h αἰεὶ θεοῦⁱ μισοπόνηρονⁱ ὑπο-
5 λαμβάνουσιν^k ἐκφεύξεσθαιⁱ δίκην.^m ⁵πολλάκις δὲ^a καὶ πολλοὺς^b
τῶν^ο ἐπ' ἐξουσίαις^d τεταγμένων^ο τῶν πιστευθέντων^f χειρίζεις^ς φίλων^h
τὰⁱ πράγματαⁱ παραμυθία^k μετόχους^l αἱμάτων^m ἀθῶωνⁿ καταστή-
6 σασα^ο περιέβαλε^p συμφοραῖς ἀνηκέστοις,^q ⁶τῷ τῆς κακοηθείας^a
ψευδεῖ^b παραλογισμῷ^c παραλογισαμένων^d τὴν^e τῶν ἐπικρατούντων
7 ἀκέραιον εὐγνωμοσύνην.^f ⁷σκοπεῖν δὲ^a ἔξεστιν,^b οὐ^c τοσοῦτον^d ἐκ
τῶν παλαιότερων^ο ὥς^f παρεδώκαμεν^ς ἱστορίων, ὅσα^h ἐστὶνⁱ παρὰⁱ
πόδας^k ὑμᾶς^l ἐκζητούντας^m ἀνοσίωςⁿ συντετελεσμένα^ο τῇ τῶν^p
8 ἀνάξια^q δυναστευόντων^r λοιμότητι,^s ⁸καὶ^a προσέχειν εἰς^b τὰ^c μετὰ^d
ταῦτα,^e εἰς^f τὸ^ς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀτάραχον τοῖς^h πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μετ'
9 εἰρήνης παρεξόμεθα,ⁱ ⁹χρώμενοι^a ταῖς^b μεταβολαῖς,^c τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν^d
ᾧ^e ψιν ἐρχόμενα διακρίνοντας^e αἰεὶ^f μετ'^ς ἐπιεικεστέρως^h ἀπαντήσεως.ⁱ

1 n-o om L | o φρονουσιν N A | p habete L

2 a-b abunde humanitate eorum L | c-d qui eos honorificant L | e-f male sperantes L | f φρονήσαντες L

3 a om L L | b ζητούνσιν A: αιτούνσιν N* | c δε L 44, 71, 74, 76, 108, 120 | d finem L | e αυτων 93a | f επιχειροῦσιν N A 93a: επιχαιρουσι 108a: audent L | g μηχανησασθαι 249: + κακα L L

4 a + κατα N A | b αναιρουντες L: ανερουντες N c a | c υπεραγαθων 52: απειρωπαθων 93a: anid-
dorum L | d κολποις 249: praesumptionibus L | e παρελθοντες L: inflammati L | f-γ το του L |
h-ι δυναστευοντος δικαιοκριτου L | i-m malignitatem concipientes, putant se evadere L | k-ι εκφυ-
γειν διειληφotes L | k + τινες 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: διαλαβαγονσιν 93b N c b A | l εκφευξεσθαι
N*: εκφευξασθαι 44, 52, 93b, 106: + την L5 a-c om L | b om 52 | b-c πολλοστων 74, 76 | d εξουσιων L | e τεταγμενοι L: + τα L: + και 44,
71, 74, 76 | f εμπιστευομενων L | g aft j L 44, 71, 76, 236 | h om 44, 71, 76 | i om L | j προσταγματα 52:
γραμματα 249 | k παραμυθα 55: om L | l-n αιτιους αθων αιματων L | m μετενους N*: μεταγονσα A:
μεταιτιους 93b | m μετα των A | n aft o 249 | o καταστησας N A: καταστησαντες L | p περιεβαλον L |
p-a circumdederunt calumniatibus intolerabilibus L6 a κακοποιας L: αληθειας A: κακοπιστειας 93a: + τροπω N c a mg 93b | b + δε N* | c om
A L L | d παραλογισαμενος N A: παραλογισαμενοι L | e om 93b | f εγνωμοσυνην A: συγγνωμοσυνην
74, 76: επιγνωσιν N*7 a om 108a | b εστιν L | c-d om L | e-f om L | g παλαιωτερων A | f om N*: ων N | g παραδεδο-
μενων ημιν L: παραδεδωκαμεν N c a | h-ι και οσον το L | h οσον N | i + τους 44, 71, 106 | k μερος N*:
πολλας 19, 108b | l υμιν N*: ημων 44: om L | m εκζητουν N*: θεωρουντες L: εκζητούντες 93b | n αξιως
L | o om L | p om 93b | q om L: αξια N c a 93b: αναξιως C, 248: αξιας N*: αξιο A | r δυναστευ-
ομενων 93b | s ωμοτητι L: λυμοτητι A: λιμοτητι 52, Ald: ωμοιοτητι 93b | q-s digna dominantium
pestilentia L8 a om L 236 | b οσα 52 | c το N* 71, 74, 76, 249 | d-e μετ επειτα L: μετ αυτα 93b | f-γ και N c a
L: το N c b: ωστε 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald | h-ι παρεχειν πασι τοις εθνεις μετ ειρηνης L9 a ου χρωμενοι N c a A L 249 L | b δε 52: τε 243, 248, C, Ald | c διαβολαις L: varietatibus L |
d om 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120 | e-h μετ επιεικειας διεξαγοντες L | f δει N* | g μετα N A | h αγανακτησεως
N*: om L | i-cum clementissima occurrione L

- 10 ¹⁰ ὥς^a γὰρ^b Ἀμὰν^c Ἀμαδάθου^d Μακεδὼν^e ταῖς ἀληθείαις^f ἀλλότριος^g
τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν αἵματος^h καὶⁱ πολὺ διεστηκῶς^j τῆς ἡμετέρας χρηστό-
11 τητος, ἐπιξενωθείς^k ἡμῖν^l ¹¹ ἔτυχεν ἦς^a ἔχομεν^b πρὸς πᾶν ἔθνος
φιλανθρωπίας^c ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε^d ἀναγορεύεσθαι^e ἡμῶν^f πατέρα^g
καὶ προσκυνούμενον^h ὑπὸ πάντωνⁱ τὸ δεύτερον^j τοῦ βασιλικοῦ^k θρόνου^l
12 πρόσωπον^m διατελεῖν·ⁿ ¹² οὐκ ἐνέγκας^a δὲ τὴν ὑπερφηανίαν ἐπετή-
13 δευσεν^b τῆς ἀρχῆς στερεῇσαι^c ἡμᾶς^d καὶ^e τοῦ πνεύματος^f ¹³ τὸν τε^a
ἡμέτερον^b σωτήρα^c καὶ^d διὰ παντὸς^e εὐεργέτην^f Μαρδοχαίου καὶ τὴν
ἄμεμπτον^g τῆς^h βασιλείαςⁱ κοινωνὸν^j Ἐσθῆρ σὺν παντὶ^k τῷ^l τούτων^m
ἔθνει πολυπλόκοιςⁿ μεθόδων^o παραλογισμοῖς^p αἰτησάμενος^q εἰς ἀπω-
14 λίαν· ¹⁴ διὰ^a γὰρ τῶν^b τρόπων^c τούτων^d ᾧ^eθηε^f λαβὼν^g ἡμᾶς^h ἐρή-
μουςⁱ τῇ^j τῶν^k Περσῶν ἐπικράτησιν^l εἰς τοὺς Μακεδόνας^m μετάξαι.ⁿ
15 ¹⁵ ἡμεῖς^a δὲ^b τοὺς^c ὑπὸ τοῦ τρισαλιτηρίου^d παραδεδομένους εἰς^e ἀφα-
νισμόν^f Ἰουδαίους^g εὕρισκομεν^h οὐⁱ κακούργους^j ὄντας,^k δικαιοτάτοις^l
16 δὲ^m πολιτευομένουςⁿ νόμοις,^o ¹⁶ ὄντας^a δὲ^b υἱοὺς^c τοῦ ὑψίστου^d μεγί-
στου^e ζῶντος^f θεοῦ^g τοῦ^h κατευθύνοντοςⁱ ἡμῖν^j τε^k καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις
17 ἡμῶν^l τὴν βασιλείαν^m ἐνⁿ τῇ καλλίστῃ διαθέσει·^o ¹⁷ καλῶς οὖν
ποιήσετε^a μὴ προσχρησάμενοι^b τοῖς^c ὑπὸ Ἀμὰν^d Ἀμαδάθου^e ἀπο-

10 a-b ἐπιξενωθείς γὰρ ἡμῖν L | c Ἀμμαν 19: om 249 | d Ἀμαθον A: o μαδαθον 93a: Ἀμαθαδον 236 (always) | d-e om 44, 71, 106 | e Βουγαίος L | f ανομiais 19, 108b | g aft h 93b | h φρονήματος L | i om 19, 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | ιδιςσως L: begin. λα N* (improb λα N*) ferens L | k-l om L | k ξενωθείς C

11 a-b της εξ ημων L | a ως N | c-d φιλανθρωπίας ωστε 44, 71, 76, 106, 120 | e φιλανθρωπιαν 236, C | d ως A: τε 52 | e αναγορευεσθαι N*: αναγορευθηναι L: αγορευεσθαι C: om L | f-g tr L | h προσκυνουμενος A: προσκυνεισθαι L | i omnibus subditis nobis L: + και 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | j δευτερον 108b | k βασιλικων L: βασιλειων 19, 108b | l θρονων L | m om L | j-n et secundum habens sedile L

12 a ενεγκων L | b επετηδευσε N: επιτηδευσεν A: επετελευσε 52: ενετηδευσε 93b: ausus est L: + ημας L | c-d om L: tr A | c στερεσαι N*: δυνας N* | e-f om 71 | e om A | f + μετασθησαι L

13 a δε L | b-f om 44, 106 | c σωτηραν N*: om 71 | d om L | e παντων 52, 243, 248, 249, C, Ald: om 71 | f om L | g invocabilem L | h-i τουτου L: aft j 52 | i βασιλειως N* | j κοινωνων 52: κοινωνην 93a: om 44 | k-l tr L | m εξης L | n πολυτροποις 93a: πολυπλοκων 249 | o μεθοδεις L: μεθοδοις 17, 19, 108b, 249 | p om L 71 L | q διαρτησαμενος L: στήσαμενος 93a

14 a-j om 93a | b-d τουτων των τροπων L: τον τροπον τουτον 44, 106 | d om A | e ηθη N*: ωθηει A: ηρηθη 93b | f λαβειν N: a A | g τας A | h + εξαλλοτριωσιν L | i-m om 71 | i της L: + τε N: a A 93b: τη 249 | j om A | k επικρατησει 249: επικρατειας L: + εως L | l Μακαιδονας N: Μακεδωνας 93a | m αγαγειν L: μεταλλαξει 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: μεταγαγειν 93b, 108a: μεταταξει C

15 a-b om L | c + ουν L | d + et impio L | e-f υμιν L | g Juidaeorum L | h ευρισκομενους N: qui inveniuntur L | i-j tr A | i μη L: om N | j-k tr L | k + αλλα 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | l αναγκαιοτατους N* | m om 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236 | n-o tr 93a | n πολιτευομενοις 93a | o om 44

16 a-ενιους οντας 44, 106: filii L | a-17a om 71 | a on 93a | b + και L | c ενιους N*: aft d 249 | d-f μονου L | d-e om 44, 106 | d om του A | e-f om L: tr 76 | e pr του 93b | f οντος 93b | g + και αληθι- νου L | h om 93b | i κατευθυνοντας N*: κατευθυναντος L 74, 120, 236 | j ημας N* | k-l om L: et pos- teris L | k om 106 | m αγιαν N*: + μεχρι του νυν L | n-o sicut volumus L

17 a ποιησητε N: ποιησατε A 52, 108: ποιησετε 93a: ποιετε 243, 248, C, Ald: | b προσερχοντες L: om 249 | c-f τοις προαπεσταλμενοις υμιν υπο Αμαν L | d Μαν A: του Αμαν N | e Αμαθαδον A 52: om L 44, 71, 106, L

- 18 σταλείσι^f γράμμασιν,^g ¹⁸ διὰ τὸ^a αὐτὸν^b τὸν^c ταῦτα^d ἐξεργασάμενον^e
 πρὸς ταῖς Σούσων^f πύλαις ἐσταυρώσθαι^g σὺν^h τῇⁱ πανοικίᾳ,^j τὴν
 καταξίαν^k τοῦ τὰ^l πάντα ἐπικρατοῦντος^m θεοῦⁿ διὰ τάχους ἀπο-
 19 δόντος^o αὐτῷ^p κρίσιν.^q ¹⁹ τὸ^a δὲ^b ἀντίγραφον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ταύτης^c
 ἐκθέντες^d ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ μετὰ^e παρρησίας,^f ἐᾶν^g τοὺς^h Ἰουδαίουςⁱ
 20 χρῆσθαι^j τοῖς ἑαυτῶν^k νομίμοις,^l ²⁰ καὶ^a συνεπισχύειν^b αὐτοῖς^c ὅπως
 τοὺς^d ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως ἐπιθεμένους^e αὐτοῖς^f ἀμύνωνται^g τῇ^h τρισκαι-
 21 δεκάτῃⁱ τοῦ^j δωδεκάτου^k μηνὸς^l Ἀδάρ τῇ^m αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ.ⁿ ²¹ ταύτην^a
 γὰρ^b ὁ^c πάντα^d δυναστεύων θεὸς^e ἀντ'^f ὀλεθρίας^g τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ
 22 γένους^h ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖςⁱ εὐφροσύνην.^j ²² καὶ ὑμεῖς^a οὖν^b ἐν ταῖς
 ἐπωνύμοις ὑμῶν^c ἐορταῖς^d ἐπίσημον ἡμέραν^e μετὰ πάσης εὐωχίας
 23 ἄγετε,^g ²³ ὅπως^a καὶ^b νῦν καὶ^c μετὰ^d ταῦτα^e σωτηρίᾳ^f ἡμῖν^g καὶ^h τοῖςⁱ
 εὐνοοῦσιν^j Πέρσαις, τοῖς^k δὲ ἡμῖν ἐπιβουλευούσιν^l μνημόσυνον^m τῆς
 24 ἀπωλείας.ⁿ ²⁴ πᾶσα^a δὲ^b πόλις^c ἥ^d χώρα^e τὸ^f σύνολον^g ἦτις^h κατὰ
 ταῦτα μὴⁱ ποιήσῃ^j δόρατι καὶ πυρὶ καταναλωθήσεται^k μετ'^l ὀργῆς.^m
 οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἄβαστος, ἀλλὰ καὶ θηρίοις καὶ πετεινοῖς εἰς^m τὸν
 ἅπαντα χρόνονⁿ ἔχθιστος^o κατασταθήσεται.^p

17 ἰ αποσταλιση **N*** | **g** γραμμασι **A**

18 a-g διεταξα σταυρωθῆναι αυτον εν Σουσοις 71 | a+και **L**: τουτο 108a, 249 | b om 108a | c om **N*** **A** 249, 108b1 | d τα τοιαυτα **L** | e εργασαμενον **L**: ειρημενον 19, 108b | f Σουσοις **N** | h-q om 71 | h-1 αποδεωκοτος αυτω **L** | i om **N** | j παροικια 76 | k+δικην **L** | l om **N*** 52, 248 | m κατοπτευοντος **L** | n-o om **L** | o απολοντος 55: αποδοντα 106: αποδοντες 243 | p-q αει κριτω+ εκτεθητω **L**

19 a-b δε το **L** | c-d om **L** | e εκτεθεντος **N***: εκτεθεντες **A**: *exronens* **L** | e-f om **L** **L** | g-1 χρῆσθαι τε τους Ιουδαιους **L**: *permitte omnes Iudaeos uti* **L** | h-i τοις Ιουδαιοις 74 | j χρῆσασθαι 52, 64, 243, 248, C, Ald | k αυτων 249 | l νομοις **N** **A** **L** 52, 64, 93b, 243, 248, 249, C, Ald

20 a-c et confortiari cum omnibus **L** | b επισχυειν **L** | d om 44 | e επιτεμενους 52 | f om **N*** **L** | g μυνωνται **A***: αμυνασθαι **N**: αμυνονται 19, 93a, 108b: + εκριθη δε υπο των κατα την βασιλειαν Ιουδαιων αγειν **L** | h-1 την τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατην **L** | i om 236 | k om **L** 44, 74, 76, 106, 120, 236: + του 120 | l+ος εστιν **L** | m-n και τη(ν) πεντεκαιδεκατη(ν) εορτασει **L**: om 44, 106

21 a-e εν αυταις ο παντοκρατωρ **L** | a ταυτη **N*** **A**: ταυτα 236 | b om **N*** | c+τα many codd: + επι **A** | c-d απαντα Ald | f-h om **L** | g ολεθρειας **N**: ολετριας 52 | h ολεθριαν 71 | i+σωτηριαν και **L**: +εις 71, 74, 76, 93b, 106, 120, 236, **N**. c. a mg | j σωφροσυνην 19, 108b

22 om **L** | a ημεις **N***: υμεις **N**. c. a | b ου **A** | c ημων 74, 76: om **A** | d om **A** | e ημερας **N***

23 a-b om **L** | c om **L** | d-ο μετ αυτα 52 | f σωτηριαν **L**: + η many codd + εσται 74 | g-ημεν **L** **N**. c. b: υμιν και **N*** 74, 76, 106, 120: μεν υμων και **A**: ημιν 52: + εν 108a | i om **L** | j εν ποιουνσι **L**: ευνοουντων **N**. c. b **A**: ανουσι 52: συνουσι 55: ευνοουσι 108a: ευνουσι Ald | k-1 των δε επιβουλευσαντων **A**: τοις δε των επιβουλευειν αντοις τολμωντων 44, 71, 74, 106, 120, 236: τοις δε των επιβουλευειν τολμωσι 76: τοις δε ημιν επιβουλευσασι 108a | m μνημοσυνας 108a | n+ποιησετε 108a

24 a η **L** | b δε η 44, 106 | c+και **L** | d η **L**: om 93a | e χωρας **N*** | f-g om **L** 249 | h ημεις 93b | i ου 93a | j ποιησαι **L** | k+και **N**. c. a | l+και **L** C | m-n om **A** | m-o om **L** | o εχιστος **N***: εσχιστος **N**. c. a: αισχιστος **A** 93b: + τε **C** | p αυτα σταθησεται **N***: εκαθησεται **L**

CHAPTER VIII

VIII, 13 om **L** **L** | **חַשְׁבֵּן** **אֶל־מֶלֶךְ** **הַכְּתָב** om **G** (exc **N** c. a, 93b under *) | **לְהַנְתִּי** **עֲקִיבְשָׁוָן** **G**: **עֲקִיבְשָׁו** **N** **עֲקִיבְשָׁו** **A** | **תָּה** om **S** **G** (exc 93b under *) | **בְּיַדְּהָא** **תְּה** **בַּאֲרַמְיָא** **G** | **וּבְיַדְּהָא** om **S** **G** (exc

IX, 1 om L 𐤅 [הוא] quem vocari ante jam diximus 𐤅 [חדש] om
 𐤅 𐤆 𐤅 [יום בו] om 𐤆: του μηνος 𐤅 [להעשות — אשר] quando cunctis
 Judaeis interfectio parabatur 𐤅 [אשר] om 𐤅 [הגיע] + 𐤅 [דבר] 𐤆 [et]
 τα γραμματα τα γραφεντα υπο 𐤅: τα γραμματα 44, 106, 107 [ידתו להעשות]
 om 𐤅 (exc ^{c. a.m.s.} 93b under *) 𐤅 [ביום — שברו] om 𐤆 [ביום אשר] et

Φαράδα 243, 249, Ald: Φοράδα C | אֲדָלִיָּא | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: Βαρσα B: Βαρελ
 N A: Βαρεα many codd: τους ετερους 71: om L | אַרְיִדְתָּא | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S^A: 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏
 S^{LMU}: Σαρβαχα G: Σαρβακα some codd: Σαρμαχα 76: Σαρμακα 120: Σαρα-
 βαχα 236: Αριδαθα 93b, C: om L 71

9 om L 71, 106 | פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא | פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא (both ש and ת small) G:
 Phermesta I: 𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓𐤏 S^A: 𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓𐤏 S^{LMU}: Μαρμασιμα G: Μαρμασιμ N 55,
 64, 243, 248, Ald: Μαρμασιμνα A: Μαρμασιαν N: Σαρμασιν 74: Σαρμασιμ 76:
 Μαρμασιμνα L: Σαρμασιμ 120: Σαρμασιμ 236: Φαρμοσθα 93b: Φαρμασθα
 C | אַרְיִסִי | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: Αρσαιον G (tr with next): Αρσειον N: Αρισαι 93b, C:
 om L | אַרְיִדִּי | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: Ρουφαιον G: Ρουφανον A: Αρουφαιον N 55, 64, 74,
 76, 108a, 120, 236, 243, 248, Ald: Αριδαι 93b, C: om L | יִרְיָה | large י,
 small 7; so 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏: Jezatha I: 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: Ζαβουθαιον G: Ζαβουδεθαν N: Ζαβου-
 γαθα A: Ζαβουθαιθαν N 55, 64, 243, 248, Ald | Ζαφουδαιδαν 52: Ζαβουθαθαν
 108a: Ιζαθουθ L: Βαυζαθα C: Οναιζαθα 93b

10 om L | עֶשְׂרֵת | pr extra I: pr και L 44, 106, C | בֶּן הַמִּדְרָחָא | om
 I S: + Agagitae I: + 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: + (του) Βουγαίου G L: + και Βουγαίου 44,
 106: + Βουδεον N* | צִרְרָא | τους εχθρους 249 | הַיְהוּדִים | + quorum ista
 sunt nomina I | הִרְגוּ | pr quos cum I: om L G (exc N^{c.a} A, 93b under *) |
 וְרַבְּבֹזָה — יָרָם | και διηρπασαν G: και διηρπασαν παντα τα αυτων L: και ου
 διηρπασαν C: και εν τοις σκολοις ουκ απεκτειναν τας χειρας αυτων 93b under *:
 om 106

11 om L L | בְּיוֹם הַהוּא | om 106 | הַבִּירָה | om I G (exc N^{c.a}, 93b
 under *) | לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ | om 52, 93b

12 om L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | qui I | לֹא־חָתַר | om I | הַמְּלָכָה | om L G (exc
 N^{c.a mg}, 93b under *) | בִּשְׁוֹשֵׁן הַבִּירָה | om L | הִרְגוּ הַיְהוּדִים | απωλεσαν
 οι Ιουδαιοι G: πως σοι οι ενταυθα (ενταυθα η 19, 108b) L | וְאִבְדַּר | om L G
 (exc N^{c.a mg}, 93b under *) | הַמֶּן — הַמֵּשׁ | om L | הַמֶּן — וְאִת | om G (exc
 N^{c.a mg}, 93b under *) | בִּשְׁאֵר מִדִּינֹת | εν δε τη περιχωρω (χωρα A) G:
 και οι εν τη περιχωρω L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | om I S L G (exc 93b under *) | מִיָּה עֲשׂוֹ |
 quantam putas eos exercere caedem I: πως οiei εχρησαντο (κεχρηνται N^{c.a}
 A) G: κεχρηνται L: + και ειπεν ο βασιλευς προς Εσθηρ 44 | יָמִיָּה | om I 54
 codd K R, I S | וְמִיָּה — end of vs | om L (cf. 8: 2 end) | שְׂאֵלְתָּךְ | αξιους +
 ετι G: postulas + ultra I | וַיִּנְתֵּן | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S: και εσται G: om I | לָךְ | om
 I | וְמִיָּה² — end of vs | om G (exc 93b under *) | עוֹר | om I S | וְחֵשׁ |
 ut fieri jubeam I: 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 S

13 om L | טוֹב — אֵם | om S L: τω βασιλει G: αυτω 44: εαν τω βασιλει
 φανη 93b under * | גָּם | om S G L | אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁוֹשֵׁן | om S G (exc 93b under *):
 ους εαν θελωσιν L | לַעֲשׂוֹת | χρησησθαι G: αελειν L | כִּדְתֵּי הַיּוֹם | 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏
 S: ωσαντως G: και διαρπαζειν L | הַעֵץ — וְאִת | om L (cf. 8: 7 end) | עַל הַעֵץ |
 om G (exc N^{c.a}, 93b under *)

14 om L 106 | וַיֹּאמֶר | και επετρεψεν G: και συνεχωρησεν L: επεστρεψεν
 N* | הַמֶּלֶךְ — end of vs | om L | הַמֶּלֶךְ | om G (exc 93b under *) | וְחֵתָן |

και εξεθηκε(ν) ⑤ | דת | τοις Ιουδαιοις ⑥: + τη τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατη του Αδαρ και απεκτειναν ανδρας τριακοσιους 236 | בשושן | της πολεως ⑥: om N* | ואת | עשרת | τα σωματα ⑥: om N* | תלו | κρεμασαι ⑥: + על העץ K 147, 180; R 443, S, 249

15 om L ④ | היהודיים | היהודים Q | אשר | om ③ ⑤ | בשושן | om 71 | גם ביום | om ⑥ (exc 93b under *) | איש — ביום | tr aft דת vs 14, 236 | להדש | ⑤: om ⑥ (exc N* N^{c.a}, 93b under *) | אדר | om S N* | בשושן² | om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a} mg, 93b under *): + οι Ιουδαιοι N^{c.a} mg, 93b under ÷ | ויבזזה | ידם — ויבזזה | και ουδεν (ουθεν A) διηρπασαν ⑥: και ουθεν διηρπασεν 93b under ÷: + και ουκ εξετειναν τας χειρας αυτων εις διαρπαγην 93b under *

16 om ④ | ומאביהם — ושאר | om L | ושאר | om ③ | אשר | om 44, 106: οι εν τη βασιλεια ⑥: παν εν τη βασιλεια 248 | במדינות | במדינות 15 codd K R, ③ | המלך | om ⑥: Αρταξεργέου 71, 74, 76, 236 | בכל מדינות | om ③ | ועבד | και εαντοις εβοηθουν | על נפשם | om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a}, 93b under *) | והרוג | והנקם conj G: והנקם or ונקום conj Buhl | ונהרג | ⑤: απωλεσαν γαρ ⑥: και απωλεσαν L | בשניהם | ⑤: δυνατων N*: om L | אלף | המשה ושבעים אלף | μυριους πεντακισχιλιους ⑥: μυριαδας επτα και εκατον ανδρας L | ידם — ויבזזה | και ουδεν διηρπασαν (N^{c.a} mg, 93b under * = ④): om L A

17-19 om L ④ | ביום — בו | om 71 | ביום | om S ⑤ | שלושה | ⑤: τεςσρες A | להדש | ⑤: om ⑥ | אדר | + primus apud omnes interfectionis fuit ③: om N* | ונהרג | ⑤: om A | בו | ⑤: του αυτου μηνος ⑥ | ועשה | ועשו Q in some codd G, ③ S ⑤ | אחו | + esse solemnem ut in eo omni tempore deinceps vacarent epulis ③ | משתה | αναπανσεως μετα χαρας ⑥: αναπανσεως 71 | ישמחה | om 71

18 om K 76, 107, 111, S L ④ 106 | והיהודיים | והיהודים Q: hi ③ | נקהלו | + τη πολει ⑥ (exc N*): + urbe caedem exercuerant ③ | בשושן | in caede versati sunt ③ | בשלושה עשר בו | om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a} mg, 93b under *): + μηνος Αδαρ 93b under ÷ | ובארבעה — end of vs | om 71 | בו² | om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a} mg, 93b under *): του Αδαρ 74, 76 | ונהרג | και ουκ ανεπανσαντο B 55, 74, 76: ανεπανσαντο N^{c.b} A N 93b C: και ανεπανσαντο other codd | בו³ | om ⑥ | ועשו | ועשו K 176, Q: et ideirco constituerunt ③: ηγον δε ⑥ | יום | אחו | om ⑥: + solemnem ③ | משתה | μετα χαρας ⑥

19 om L ④ | על כן | hi vero ③ | הפרוים | הפרוים Q: om ③ | הישבים | ⑤: om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a}, 93b under *) | בערי הפרות | ⑤: om ⑥ (exc 93b under *) | ונהרג | in oppidis non muratis ac villis ③: εν παση χωρα τη εξω ⑥ | יום | ⑤: om ⑥ (exc 93b under *) | להדש | om S ⑤ (exc 93b under *) | ובמשתה | om ⑥ (exc N^{c.a}, 93b under *) | ובמשתה | some codd N¹ | ולעדה | + οι δε κατοικουντες εν ταις μητροπολειν και την πεντεκαίδεκατην του Αδαρ (+ ημεραν N A) ευφροσυνην (-ης N A) αγαθην αγουσιν εξαποστελλοντες μεριδus και τοις πλησιον B N A N 52, 55, 64, 74, 76, 108a, 236, 248, C, Ald (with slight variations in the different codd)

21 [על־יהם] om Θ L: *pro festis 3 + solemni honore 3: + τας ημερας*
ταυτας αγαθας Θ: + *τας ημερας ταυτας εις γμνους και ευφροσυνας αντι οδυνων*
και πενθους L | [לחיות עשים] om L | [את יום] om L 3 Θ (exc 93b under *):
 3 S | [לחדש] om S L 3 Θ (exc א e. a. mg, 93b under *) | [אדר] om S A L:
 του Αγαρ Α * | [יום] om S 3 L Θ (exc 93b under *) | [חמשה עשר]
 ח מנ חמנ | [ושנה — בכל] om Θ 3 L: | [בר] om Θ 3 L: S: *revertente semper anno 3*

23 וקבלו [וּקְבִּלוּ] 29 codd K R, ט¹ ט² ז ש ט ז L | [הַיְּהוּדִים] +
 ש: + *in solemnem ritum* ז | [לְעִשׂוֹת] — א¹ את om L ט (exc 93b
 under *): *et posuerunt in commemoratione* ז | ואת — end of vs 25 om
 L | [מִדְּרָכִי] om ז | [עֲלֵיהֶם] [אֲלֵיהֶם] 19 codd K, 26 codd R: om K 236, ש

25 om L 4 | ובבאה — והספר om 71 | [וּבְבִּאָהָה] so Oc: רַבְּבִיָּהָה (Raphē)
Or (Ginsburg): et postea ingressa est Esther 3: כַּחַל הַזֶּה אֶשְׁלַח;
3: και ως εισαγγελθεν 6 | הַמִּנְיָךְ | + obsecrans ut conatus ejus 3 | אֲמַר עַם
[הַסֵּפֶר] litteris regis iriti fierent 3: אֲנִי הֵן שֶׁחָלֵל 3: λεγων κρεμασαι τον

Μαρδοχαϊον G (93b under ÷) | [יִשׁוּב] S: εγενοντο G: εγενετο A | [אֲשֶׁר הִשָּׁב] S | ראשו tr aft [הַיְּהוּדִים -- אֲשֶׁר] om J G | [מִהַשְׁבֹּתוֹ] S: οσα δε επεχειρησεν επαξαι G (πραξαι 71, επαγαγεν 93b) | [עַל רֹאשׁוֹ] επ αυτον G | [וְהָלַךְ אִתּוֹ] S: και εκρεμασθη αυτος G | [עַל הָעֵץ] om G (exc N^{c.s.,c.b} A N, 93b under *)

26 om L 71 | [לִימִים הָאֵלֶּה] om A | [פֻּרִים] plurim J: פֻּרִים S: Φουραι G: Φουριμ N^{c.a}: Φουρδαῖ L Φουρμαῖ 19, 108b, Φουρδια 93a): Φουρουριμ 93b: Φουριν 249: Φουριμ C: Φουρεας (Φουραιους) Jos xi, § 295 | [עַל שֵׁם] id est J: δια G L | [הַפֹּר] sortium J: פֻּרִים S: τους κληρους G L: τους καιρους N | [עַל כֵּן] eo quod J: οτι G: τους πεσοντας L: om S 106: + plur id est sors in urnam missa fuerint J: + τη (+idia 249) διαλεκτω αυτων καλουνται Φουραι (Φουρ 93b: all under ÷ 93b) G | [עַל] — end of vs 27 | om L | [עַל] et J: δια G: και δια 93b | [כֹּל] om S G | [דְּבָרֵי] quae gesta sunt J: om 108a | [הָאֵגֶרֶת] epistolae + id est libri hujus volumine continentur J: της επιστολης G | [וְיִמָּה] S: — end of vs om 44, 106 | [עַל טַוּטָּה] δια ταυτα (ταυτην: αυτην) G: om J S | [וְיִמָּה] S: πεπονθασιν G | [עַל כֵּכָה] δια ταυτα (ταυτην: αυτην) G: om J S | [וְיִמָּה] S: δεινεψ [הִגִּיעַ אֵלֵיהֶם] deinceps immutata sunt J

27 om L L | [קִימָר] και εστησε(ν) G: εστησαν N: εστησε μνημοσυνον 74, 76, 236: om S J | [יַעֲבֹר] — קִימָר om 44, 71, 106 | [וְקִבְלוּ] Q, Kēthibh in many codd N¹, T¹ T² J S G | [כֹּל] om G (exc 93b under *) | [הַנְּלוֹיִם] sing. S | [וְלֹא] S: | [אֲלֹוֹס] αλλως χρησηονται G | [לְהִיּוֹת] — end of vs | om G (exc 93b under *) | [וְשִׁנָּה] S: | [וְכֻזְּנִים] S

28 om 44, 106 | [וְהַיּוֹמִים] eis tas hemeras L: et diei L | [הָאֵלֶּה] om L | [מְזִכְרִים] μνημοσυνον G: μνημοσυναῖ A: eis μνημοσυνον L: mentionem fecit L | [וְנִעְשִׂים] — end of vs 32 om L | [וְנִעְשִׂים] om L: επιτελουμενον G: επιτελουμεναι A | [בְּכֹל] om G L | [דֹּר וְדֹר] om S: progeniam L | [וּבִיּוֹנִיָּה] om J S G | [מִשְׁפָּחָה] S: και πατριαν G L | [וּבִיּוֹנִיָּה] om J S G | [וְיִעִיר] om J S G L | [יִרְמִי] indicens L | [הַפֻּרִים] των Φουραι G: των Φουρων N*: του Φουραι A: των Φουρουριμ 93b: των Φουριν 249: vigiliis L: plurim J: פֻּרִים S | [הָאֵלֶּה] id est sortium J: om L | [לֹא יַעֲבֹר] nec non obserrentur J: αχθησονται G: quas celebrarent L | [מִחוּךְ יְהוּדִים] a Judaeis J: eis τον απαντα χρονον G L | [זִכְרָם לֹא יִסֹּף] om J | [מְזִרְעָם] ab eorum progenie + quae his caeremoniis obligata est J: εκ των γενεων G: de progenie L

29 om L | [וְהִתְחַב] so M (with large ת); some codd with ordinary ת | [אֲמִינָדָב] Αμιναδαβ G: Αμιναδαν N: om L | [הַיְּהוּדִי] om 71, 74, 76, 106, 236, L | [אֶת כָּל חֻקָּה] το τε στερεωμα G: τοτε eis μνημοσυνον 44, 106: | [כָּל מִשְׁכָּח] S: omni studio J | [לְקִים] firmamentum L | [וְיִסְכָּח] S: οσα εποισαν G: fecit L | [הַפֻּרִים] dies solemnīs J: פֻּרִים S: των Φουραι G (Φουρων N*: Φουριμ N^{c.b}: Φουραῖ A: Φουρουριμ 93b): custodientium L | [וְהָאֵת הַשְּׁנִית] om G L: om הַשְּׁנִית S: + in posterum J

30 om L L G | [וְיִשְׁלָה] plu J S | [כַּפְרִים] om J | [רֵגִיס] J: + [שְׁלֹום וְאַמֶּת] tr S

32 om L 71, 106 | [וְהַמִּזְמֹר] και λογω: λογω N* A: qui vocatur I | קים + הָאֱלֹהִים S: et omnia quae libri huius I: εστησεν (+ αυτα 74, 76) εις τον αιωνα G | ויכתב בספר historia continentur I: και εγραφη εις μνημοσυνον G: + literal version of vs 30 אִמְרָה to end of vs 32, 93b under *

X, 1 om א | יישׁ | εγραψεν δε 6: εγραψεν γαρ A: και εγραψεν L: fecit 3 | אחרשׁ so Oc: אחרשׁוּשׁ Q Oc: אחרשׁוּשׁוּ Kēthibh Or N¹ S C: om 6 L (exc 8^c a mg inf, 93b under *) | מם tributarias 3: τελη 8 A 93b (under *): τα τελη L: om 6 | על omnem 3: + 6 3: επι την βασιλειαν 6 (την βασιλειαν under + 93b): επι την βασιλειαν αυτου 44: om L | יאיי + cunctas 3: om יאיי 6 L

3 [יהודהרי] om G L 11 (exc N^{c. a. mg.}, 93b under *) | [משנה] + | om S: διεδεχετο G L: *suscipiebat* 11 | [למלך] τον βασιλεα G L L | [אשרוריש] Αρταξερξην G: Ξερξην L: + *in die illa* 11 | [וגדול] + | om S: + ην G L L | [ליהודים] εν τη βασιλεια G L 11: S: for ל S | [אחיו—ורצויו] om S | [ורצויו] και δεδοσασμενος G: και φιλονυμενος L: *et magnificatus* 11 | [אחיו] λרב אחיו | υπο των Ιουδαιων (Βασιλεων 71) και φιλονυμενος G (om και φιλ. 44, 106, 249): υπο παντων των Ιουδαιων L: *a Judaeis et ex ducatu* 11 | [דרש] (δι)ηγματο G: και ηγετο L: *praeerat* 11 | [שוב] την αγωγην G: om L 11 | [לעביו] — [שלום] om G L: αυτων και δοξαν περιτιθει L | [זרעו] τω εθνει αυτου G L 11: + the following passage (F: 1–11) in G L 11 (93b under +):

ADDITION F

- 1 ¹Καὶ εἶπεν^α Μαρδοχαῖος^β Παρὰ τοῦ^γ θεοῦ^δ ἐγένετο ταῦτα.
 2 ²ἐμνήσθην^α γὰρ^β περὶ^γ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου^δ οὐ εἶδον^ο περὶ^ι τῶν λόγων τοῦ-
 3 των^ς οὐδὲ^η γὰρ^ι παρήλθεν^ι ἀπ'^κ αὐτῶν^ι λόγος·^μ ³ἡ μικρά^α πηγὴ
 ἡ^β ἐγένετο ποταμός, καὶ ἦν φῶς καὶ ἥλιος καὶ ὕδωρ πολὺ.^ο Ἐσθὴρ
 ἐστίν^δ ὁ^ο ποταμός, ἣν ἐγάμησεν^ι ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ^ς ἐποίησεν^η βασι-
 4 ⁴λισσαν·^ι ⁴οἱ^α δὲ^β δύο^ο δράκοντες, ἐγὼ εἰμι^δ καὶ Ἀμάν·^ο ⁵τὰ^α δὲ^β
 6 ἔθνη, τὰ ἐπισυναχθέντα^ο ἀπολέσαι τὸ^δ ὄνομα^ο τῶν^ι Ἰουδαίων·^ς ⁶τὰ^α
 δὲ ἔθνος τὸ ἐμὸν, οὗτός ἐστιν^β Ἰσραὴλ οἱ βοήσαντες πρὸς τὸν θεὸν
 καὶ σωθέντες.^ο καὶ^δ ἔσωσεν Κύριος^ο τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐρρύσατο^ι
 Κύριος^ς ἡμᾶς^η ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν τούτων·^ι καὶ^ι ἐποίησεν^κ ὁ θεὸς
 τὰ σημεῖα καὶ^ι τὰ^μ τέρατα^ν τὰ^ο μεγάλα^β ἃ^ι οὐ γέγονεν ἐν^ι τοῖς
 7 ἔθνεσιν. ⁷διὰ^α τοῦτο^β ἐποίησεν^ο κλήρους δύο, ἕνα^δ τῷ λαῷ^ο τοῦ^ι
 8 θεοῦ^ς καὶ ἕνα πᾶσι^η τοῖς ἔθνεσιν·^ι ⁸καὶ^α ἦλθον^β οἱ δύο κληροὶ οὗτοι^ο
 εἰς ὥραν^δ καὶ^ο καιρὸν^ι καὶ εἰς^ς ἡμέραν^η κρίσεως^ι ἐνώπιον^ι τοῦ θεοῦ^κ
 9 καὶ^ι πᾶσι τοῖς^μ ἔθνεσιν,^ν καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ^α θεὸς^β τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ,^ο καὶ
 10 ἐδικαίωσεν^δ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ.^ο ¹⁰καὶ ἔσονται αὐτοῖς^α αἱ ἡμέ-
 ραι αὐταὶ ἐν^β μηνί^ι Ἀδάρ,^δ τῇ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ καὶ^ο τῇ^ι πεντε-
 καίδεκάτῃ^ς τοῦ αὐτοῦ^η μηνός,^ι μετὰ^ι συναγωγῆς^κ καὶ χαρᾶς καὶ^ι
 εὐφροσύνης ἐνώπιον^μ τοῦ θεοῦ^ν κατὰ γενεάς^ο εἰς^β τὸν^ι αἰῶνα^ι ἐν τῷ
 λαῷ αὐτοῦ^ς Ἰσραὴλ.^ι

F: 1 α ειπε L | b + ad omnes B | c-d κυριον 44, 71, 74, 76, 106

2 α εμνησθη L 68 | b om B? A 44, 93b, 106; + Mardochaeus B | c om L | d + sui B | e ειδεν L | f-g om L: περι τον λογον τουτον 52 | h-i και απετελεσθη L | h-i ου γαρ B: ουδεν A: ου τε γαρ 249 | k-m om L | k om A | i αυτου 44 | m + και ειπεν L

3 α + η 108a | b om 44, 52, 55, 71, 74, 106, 236, C | b-c om L B | d ην 44, 93b | e-i om L B | f εγημεν 71: εποησεν 106 | g-h om 106

4 α-β και οι L | b om 106 | c om A | d ημην B*: εμην 93a | e Αμμαν 19: Αμα 93a

5 α-β ποταμος τα L: flumina autem B | b om 93b | c συναχθεντα L | d-e om L: το γενοσ 44, 106
 f τους L | g Ιουδαιους L

6 α-c ηλιος και φως οι εγενοντο τοις Ιουδαιοις επιφανεια του θεου, τουτο το κριμα L: sol et luna erant Judaei. hoc iudicium B | b + o A 52, 64, 68, 248, C, Ald | d-i om L B | e om A | f ερυσατο A 52 | g om B: c. α A 44, 71, 74, 76, 93b, 106, 236 | h om N | j om B | k + κυριος N | l-n om 106 | m om 68 | o-r ταυτα L B: + ταυτα N | q om B | r om 93b, 108a

7 α-i om A 19, 71, 236 | a-b και L B | c + κυριος 52 | d + εν 52 | d-g ενα τω θεω του λαου B | e-f om 93b | f-g om B | g θεω 93b | h om L B | h-i τοις εθνεσι πασι 249 | i genti B

8 α-n om B* 71, 236 | b προσηλθον L: accesserunt B | c αυτοι B: om A | d ωρας L | e κατα L: secundum B | f κληρον B α-β B: A 93b, 108a | g om L 44, 106 C B | h ημερας L | i κυριενσεως L | j-k του αιωνιου L | l εν L B 52, 68, 243, 249, C, Ald: + εν B: c. α 45, 55, 71, 74, 76, 106, 108a | m om A

9 α-β om B: ο κυριος A: κυριος 249 | c om 93a | d servavit B | e αυτον B A L and many codd: + και πασ ο λαος ανεβοησε φωνη μεγαλη και ειπεν Ευλογητος ει κυριε ο μνησθεις των διαθηκων των προς τους πατερας ημων: αμην L

10 α in B | b-c ο μην 106: om 71 | d Αδερ 71: + εν L | e-i om B | e-g om B* A* 248, C | f om N | h om many codd | i om 44, 106 | j-k dies synagogae B | j + της 93a, 108b | l μετ 52, 64, 68, 243, Ald | m-n om B | o γενεαν A: γενεσεις 19: progenie vestra B | p-r om B | q om 93a | s om B | t om 52, 64, 68, 243, C, Ald: + αμην 93a

- 11 ^{11v}Ετους τετάρτου βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας^a
 εἰσήνεγκεν Δοσίθεος,^b ὃς^c ἔφη εἶναι ἱερεὺς καὶ Λευεΐτης,^d καὶ Πτολε-
 μαῖος ὁ^e υἱὸς^f αὐτοῦ τὴν προκειμένην^g ἐπιστολὴν τῶν Φρουραί,^h ἣν
 ἔφασανⁱ εἶναι καὶ ἑρμηνευκέναι^j Λυσίμαχον^k Πτολεμαίου^l τῶν^m ἐν
 Ἱερουσαλὴμ.ⁿ

11 om L (exc 19) **ℒ** | ^aΚλαιοπατρας A | ^bΔωσιθεος B*: Δωσειθεος **ℵ**: Δοσιθε 19 | ^com **ℵ***: +
 ην ως 249 | ^dΛευιτης **ℵ** A | ^eom A | ^{e-f}ουτος 55 | ^gπροειρημενην 71, 106 | ^hΦρουραια **ℵ*** A: Φρουριμ
ℵ^c a: Φρουρε 52: Φουριμ C: Φουραι 19 | ⁱεφρασαν N: εφθασαν 71, 106 | ^jηρμηνευκεναι A, many
 codd | ^kΣημαχον 44: Δυσιμαχον 55: Αυσιμαχον 93b: Λυσημαχον 106: Λισιμαχον C + τον 44, 71, 74,
 76, 106 | ^lΠτολεμαιον 44, 106 | ^mτον many codd: ου των 93b | ⁿΙσραηλ 74: + Subscr Εσθηρ B **ℵ** A:
 + αντεβληθη προς παλαιωτατον λιαν αντιγραφον δεδιорθωμενον χειρι του αγιου μαρτυρος Παμφιλου·
 προς δε τω τελει του αυτου παλαιωτατου βιβλιου οπερ αρχην μεν ειχεν απο της πρωτης των βασιλειων·
 εις δε την Εσθηρ εληγεν· τοιαντη τις εν πλατει ιδιοχειρος υποσημειωσις του αυτου μαρτυρος υπεκ-
 ειτο εχουσα ουτως· μετελημφη και διορθωθη προς τα εξαπλα Ωριγενους υπ αυτου διορθωμενα· Αντωνι-
 νος ομολογητης αντεβαλε· Παμφιλος διορθωσατο τευχος εν τη φυλακη δια την του θῦ πολλῇ και
 χαριν και πλατυσμοῦ και ει γε μη βαρυ ειπει τουτω τω αντιγραφῳ παραπλησιον ευρειν αντιγραφον ου
 ραδιον, διεφωνη δε το αυτο παλαιωτατον βιβλιῳ προς τοδε το τευχος εις τα (corr τινα) κυρια ονοματα
ℵ^c a, c, b mg inf

APPARATUS FOR THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM
OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH

CHARLES CUTLER TORREY

THE APPARATUS FOR THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH

CHARLES CUTLER TORREY

I did not at first intend to devote a separate article to this subject, as I did not wish to take the time and space which would be necessary. But in the process of editing and annotating the portions of the text which are to follow, it became evident that some extended justification of my critical procedure would be indispensable. The original plan of setting forth the most necessary facts in an introductory page or two, to be supplemented by subsequent footnotes, might have left room for the suspicion of arbitrary or hasty methods. Other considerations, moreover, seem to make it especially desirable that I should give here some clear account, however brief and imperfect, of those parts of the apparatus regarding which I feel able to speak with confidence. The chief of these considerations are the following: (1) No critical use has ever been made of the versions of these books, nor even of any one Greek version or recension.¹ (2) No attempt has been made to determine or state the principles of such critical use. (3) The conclusions which I have already reached and stated² in regard to some of the versions and recensions of the Ezra history are so revolutionary as to need all the added corroboration of this nature that can be given them.

¹ I do not wish to seem to deal unfairly with those recent publications in which some attempt has been made to emend the massoretic text of the one or the other of these books: Kittel's *Books of Chronicles*, 1895; Guthe-Batten's *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 1901; these being the reconstructed Hebrew-Aramaic text of the *Polychrome Bible*; also Benzinger's *Bücher der Chronik*, 1901; Kittel's *Bücher der Chronik*, 1902; Siegfried's *Ezra, Nehemia und Esther*, 1901; Bertholet's *Ezra und Nehemia*, 1902; and Marti's edition of the Aramaic portions of Ezra in his *Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache*, 1896. But in the following pages sufficient evidence will be given to justify fully the assertion that no one of these attempts, so far as its treatment of text and versions is concerned, deserves to be called "critical." In all of these cases the procedure is without any fixed principles, or any preliminary study of either text or versions with a view to ascertaining their character. Moreover, no one of these scholars shows any approach to thoroughness in his employment of the materials which he actually attempts to use. If in any instance the criticism of the text went so far as to include the careful taking of the testimony of even codex B (ordinarily called "the Septuagint") throughout the whole extent of the book or passage treated, the evidence of this fact at least does not appear, while numerous indications seem to show the contrary.

² *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. XXIII; cited in the sequel as *AJSL*.

(4) Many other facts, hitherto unobserved, regarding manuscripts and versions and their characteristics and mutual relations are so important as to deserve some treatment here, at least in outline. In particular, the proof of the very momentous fact that Theodotion was the author of our "canonical" Greek version of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. ought at last to be rendered.³

I. NATURE OF THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEM

In our Hebrew-Aramaic tradition of the Chronicler's history, we have a text which is neither one of the well-preserved of those which constitute the Old Testament, nor yet among the very worst. The many lists of names have been carelessly handled, and are in correspondingly bad condition. The narrative portions read smoothly on the whole—smoothly, that is, when their authorship is taken into account—but nevertheless give plain evidence of being corrupt in many places. The trouble lies not merely in single words and phrases, but also in the apparent misplacement of a few long passages, one of which consists of several chapters. There is ground for the suspicion, moreover, that one or more passages of importance have been lost from our massoretic recension. There is good evidence of a gap after Ezra 1:11; something is plainly missing between 6:5 and 6:6; while the presence of the Story of the Youths in I Esdras suggests its own important problems.

When we come to the testimony of the Greek versions, we are confronted with two somewhat widely differing forms of the history. One of them agrees quite closely with MT, and has the same extent and arrangement; the other—obviously a mere fragment—begins near the end of Chronicles and extends not quite through the story of Ezra. During the part of the history covered by the two in common, the difference between them lies in (1) the words

³ The following discussion of the critical apparatus is only fragmentary, leaving a good many highly important matters either half treated or not touched upon at all. It contains the things in which I have happened to be especially interested, being in the main based upon collations made and facts observed by me twelve years ago, in the course of my study of the literary and historical problems of Ezra-Neh.; and the conclusions are the same, with some slight modification, as those which I then reached. But though the discussion is incomplete, I believe that it will at least lay a sure foundation for further investigation.

and phrases of the narrative, the divergence here (i. e., in the Greek) being very great; (2) the position of extended passages; (3) material of very considerable amount found in the one recension but not in the other. We have in the Greek, moreover, clear testimony to two differing Semitic texts, the difference being such as to suggest either a long history of transmission along independent lines, or else an unusual amount of freedom in the handling of the texts. Of course, both of these causes might have been operative. And finally, each one of the two main forms of the narrative, the "canonical" and the "apocryphal," has come down to us in a double Greek tradition, the one embodied in Lagarde's edition,⁴ and the other contained in the most of the existing manuscripts, including the codices (A, B, N) used in Swete's *Old Testament in Greek*. That is, for a portion of the Chronicler's history amounting to about thirteen chapters, we have at every point to compare four Greek texts.

Of other versions, aside from the Latin of Jerome, which was made from our Hebrew-Aramaic recension, we have to take into account three renderings of the I Esdras Greek, namely, the Syriac (the work of Paul of Tellā), the Ethiopic, and the old Latin. The Syriac and Arabic versions of the canonical Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. have long been known to be late and well-nigh worthless—the Arabic absolutely so—and any attempt to make a critical use or "investigation" of them is a waste of time.

It is evident from this statement of the case that the solution of the textual problem is to be gained chiefly from an examination of the Greek recensions. We need to know the relative age—and, if possible, the actual age—of the two (or more) Greek translations; the principles according to which they were made, and the extent to which they can be trusted; their mutual relations; the character and quality of the Semitic text which lies behind the Greek I Esdras. And it is obviously very important (as it is everywhere else in the Old Testament) to inquire minutely into the history of the transmission of the text, finding out how

⁴ *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior graece*, Gottingae, 1883.

and to what extent the original readings have been accidentally or deliberately changed, and distinguishing carefully the divergent lines of tradition which can be recognized. What is the real significance, for textual criticism, of the two recensions which are contained, respectively, in the editions of Swete and Lagarde? What manuscripts, or families of manuscripts, are especially noteworthy? We have one absolutely sure witness to the "Septuagint" text of Origen, in the Syro-Hexaplar version of I Esdras and a part of Nehemiah; which of our Greek MSS stand nearest to this version? In a word: On what principles shall one proceed who wishes to study critically the Hebrew-Aramaic text of these books with the aid of this unusually complicated and unusually interesting apparatus?

These are all questions which must be answered before any satisfactory criticism of the text of any part of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. can be undertaken. Up to the present time, the most of these questions have not even been raised, and not one of them has been answered with any approach to correctness. An unscholarly use of "the LXX" has been, more than any other one thing, the bane of modern Old Testament study; and if there is any portion of the Old Testament in which the consequences have been especially mischievous, that portion is Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. Those who have attempted to emend the Semitic text of these books by the aid of the Greek have been wont to take at random any seemingly useful "reading" of the nearest available text of the canonical Greek, or of I Esdras, choosing in each case either codex B (one of the worst possible MSS, as it happens) or "Lucian," as the need of the occasion may decide, treating all alike, and usually without making any attempt to criticize the Greek itself, or to go behind the text-reading of the edition which happens to be used. Few of those who have dealt at length with Chron., Ezra-Neh., or I Esdras, have attempted to state what conclusions, if any, they have reached in regard to text and versions. A. Klostermann's article "Ezra und Nehemia," in Hauck's *Realencyclopädie*³, has an account of the several versions of these two "books" which contains a good many acute observations as to details, but does not give much help in matters which are of primary importance. It is remark-

able, moreover, that in his whole discussion he should make no mention at all of the I Esdras version. Even a brief examination of this "apocryphon" might have shown him its fundamental significance.

An introductory word in regard to the *Hexapla*. I have already (*AJSL*, pp. 65-68) touched upon the status of the Chron.-Ezr. books in Origen's great work, and the apparent lack of Hexaplaric material in the MSS which are now known. As for Origen's fifth column, containing his "LXX" text, I shall show in the sequel that we have extremely good information in regard to it. Concerning the other Hexaplaric versions of these books next to nothing has hitherto been known. Field's *Hexapla* has the appearance of containing some material here, but really gives hardly anything more than a collation of L with the received text. Whether the *plus* of L is Hexaplar, or not, there is nothing to show. Of specific ascriptions there are surprisingly few, and these are confined to the books of Chronicles. Supposed readings of Aquila are noted in I Chron. 15:27; 25:1, 3; 29:25. Marked with the Σ of Symmachus are readings found in I Chron. 5:26; 9:1; 11:5; 15:27; 21:10; 25:1, 3; II Chron. 12:7; 19:11; 23:13; 26:5; 30:5; 32:5; 33:3; 34:22.

The absence of any readings from Theodotion, ordinarily a favorite among the secondary translators and a frequent source of variant Greek readings, is very noticeable. This fact, of itself, might well have suggested to students, long ago, the probability that Theodotion himself was the author of our standard version of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. As I have previously remarked (*AJSL*, p. 71, note), no sure trace of the work of Aquila or Symmachus in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah has heretofore been found. I believe that the hand of each of these two translators can be recognized in one or two places, at least, and have no doubt that a careful search would reveal other instances. In all probability, the "Aquila" and "Symmachus" columns of the *Hexapla* were both duly filled, in the canonical Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., the "Theodotion" column alone being vacant. In I Esdras, on the other hand, the "LXX" column alone was filled, all the others remaining unoccupied.

II. THEODOTON THE AUTHOR OF OUR "CANONICAL" GREEK VERSION OF CHRONICLES-EZRA-NEHEMIAH

I have more than once stated my own conviction that the translation of the Chronicler's history which now stands in our Greek Bible was the work of Theodotion.⁵ Others who have held and expressed this view are Grotius (1644), Whiston (1722), Pohlmann (1859), and most recently, Sir Henry Howorth; see *AJSL*, p. 121. No one of these scholars, however, excepting the first named, has been able to bring forward any direct evidence tending to establish the theory. The manner of the argument has been simply this: 'Our Greek version of the Chronicler's history bears the marks of a late origin, especially when compared with the version preserved in "First Esdras." Theodotion's version of Daniel supplanted the older translation, in the Greek Bible; it is therefore a plausible supposition that it was Theodotion who made the later translation of the Chronicler's books.' Grotius, in his annotations to the Old Testament, pointed out an interesting bit of evidence, though in such a way as to leave some doubt as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. In a note on II Chron. 35:6, he says that our Greek version of Chronicles is that of Theodotion, while the two chapters (35 and 36) of II Chron. with which I Esdras begins are "from the Septuagint." He also adds: "*Theodotionis autem interpretationem in Paralipomenis et aliis quibusdam libris recepit Graeca Ecclesia.*" He expresses himself cautiously in this passage, saying nothing either in regard to the remainder of I Esdras or to the canonical Ezr.-Neh., for the obvious reason that the bit of proof which he happens to be using here, namely the rendering of the Hebrew word מִצֵּה, would be a conspicuous failure in Ezra 6:19 ff. (= I Esdr. 7:10 ff.). "Theodotion," he has just observed, very acutely, "semper vertit φασεκ, non ut alii interpretes πάσχα."⁶ The pos-

⁵ *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, London, 1903, pp. 139 f.; *AJSL*, pp. 67 f.

⁶ The assertion is a little too sweeping, for some of the "other translators" rendered the Hebrew word in still other ways, though Grotius may not have been aware of the fact. And indeed, from the citations given in Field's *Hexapla* it might seem that the transliteration φασεκ, outside the books of Chronicles, is not the property of Theodotion. It is not only lacking in Field's list (pp. xl f.) of the Theodotion transliterations, but is even attributed to Symmachus in the three passages where its occurrence is noted by him,

sible value of this observation is apparent when we notice that the form $\phi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\kappa$ (or rather $\phi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\chi$) occurs eighteen times in the book of Chronicles, but nowhere else in our Greek Old Testament. As for the one passage in E^zr.-N^{eh}. in which the passover is mentioned, namely E^zr. 6: 19-21, it is of course easy to suppose that the long familiar word $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ was substituted at an early date; there were many such substitutions in the early history of the Greek Bible.

The problem of identifying a given translation as the work of Theodotion is in some respects a peculiar one. Whoever makes the search for this translator's own work, with the purpose of setting apart everything that could be called characteristic of him, will probably be surprised to find how little in extent the material really is. We have, it is true, "Theodotion's version" of the whole book of Daniel; but this is in reality merely a revision of the old Greek translation, whose renderings and constructions are generally retained, the alteration consisting mainly in such cutting, shaping, and supplementing as to make it fit closely the later traditional Hebrew text. In the case of the extensive fragments of Theodotion's version of Jeremiah which have been preserved (see Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 44-46) it is not known whether the work is

namely Ex. 12:11, 27; Num. 9:2. But whoever examines carefully the material collected in Field's footnotes in these three places will ascertain the following facts: (1) According to the Syr.-Hex. (by far the most trustworthy witness of those cited) the word **ΠΟΨ**, in Ex. 12:27, was rendered by "the LXX" *πάσχα*; by Aquila *ὑπερβασις*; by Symmachus **ܡܫܥܐ** *πάσχα* (*not* *φασεχ*, as Field gives!), the difference from LXX being in the other words of the clause; and by Theodotion "like the LXX." In 12:11 the renderings are the same, except that Symmachus is said to have had *πάσχα* (*not* "*φασεχ*"!) *ὑπερμάχους*. (2) Theodoret, whom we should suppose to have had good means of information, says that Theodotion's rendering was *φασεχ*. (3) According to notes found in a few codices, in Ex. 12:11 and Num. 9:2, the transliteration *φασεχ* is attributed to Symmachus, or to "Aquila and Symmachus." Such attributions as these last, coming from unknown hands, are notoriously untrustworthy. The ancient copyists, scribblers, and annotators were as careless as our modern ones, which is saying a great deal. False ascriptions abound, and each one is likely to be copied into several other MSS. Hence most of the evidence of "double versions" of Aquila (Field, pp. xxiv ff.) or Symmachus (pp. xxxvi f.). With regard to the rendering of **ΠΟΨ**, the transliteration is exactly in the manner of Theodotion, and *not at all in the manner of Symmachus*. Indeed, the use of this barbarism by the latter translator would be altogether inexplicable. The fact is probably this: Theodotion's *φασεχ* was replaced at a very early date, in most MSS, by *πάσχα* (cf. the many cases of this kind cited below), and in the Theod. text known to Origen the latter word only was found. The Theodotion version was very well known and much used; then, when the rejected word *φασεχ* survived in a few MSS, it is natural that it should have been attributed by some to the work of Symmachus, the least known and used of the later Hexaplaric versions.

merely a version, or an independent effort. At all events, there is here extremely little that could contribute to any basis of comparison with such a book as the Chronicler's history. The manner of the author, or reviser, in his attempt to hold fast to the Hebrew, is indeed apparent, and it is the same in all three of the versions named: Daniel, Jeremiah, and the Chronicler; but more definite evidence than this is required. The comparison of the diction of our Greek version of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. with that of Theodotion's part in Daniel reveals a few striking coincidences, which will be noticed below, as well as the obvious general resemblance. In addition to the material already mentioned, we have, for our knowledge of Theodotion's work, only the scattered renderings of his in various parts of the Old Testament which have been preserved in Hexaplar codices. It might therefore seem to be a very difficult matter to collect material sufficiently extensive, and sufficiently characteristic, to serve as a sure basis for comparison. If we were dealing with ordinary translators, this would be true, and a trustworthy conclusion might be despaired of; but fortunately this translator has one peculiarity so pronounced and so well understood that the proof can be rendered complete.

As students of the Hexaplar versions long ago observed, Theodotion's chief characteristic is his tendency to *transliterate* the difficult or doubtful words of his Hebrew text. See especially Field's *Hexapla*, I, xxxix-xlii, and Swete's *Introduction*, p. 46. Because of his extreme caution, he refuses to decide in cases of uncertainty, but simply writes out the troublesome Hebrew word in Greek letters. The extent to which he has done this is very remarkable. Field gives a list (pp. xl f.) of more than ninety words of this kind, collected from the material already known to us as Theodotion's, including the most of the books of the Old Testament. Doubtless this number could be considerably increased, even from the sources which we already have, if we were better able to criticize them; moreover, it may safely be taken for granted that the ancient collectors of Hexaplaric readings generally disregarded such of Theodotion's transliterations as had resulted from an obviously corrupt and easily corrected text. Even in the MSS, indeed, the tendency to get rid of these

unnecessary barbarisms is quite marked; see below. Now, this very same striking peculiarity of transliteration is found in the Greek of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., from the beginning to the end of the work, and with the examples pretty evenly distributed. The fact has not hitherto been observed, and the number and character of the instances will probably prove a surprise to Old Testament scholars. When the comparison is made with the similar instances collected by Field, it will at once be plain that we are dealing with the same translator. I subjoin a list of the transliterations of this kind which occur in Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., not claiming that it is complete. It will be seen that it includes examples of all the classes of instances found elsewhere in Theodotion. There are the unusual words, such as כפור κεφουρ, תנורים θαννουριμ; words of ambiguous meaning in their context like הזכר ακχεχαρ, שרשרות σερσερωθ; technical terms not capable of exact translation, such as עלביות αλημωθ, בתין βαθων. Then there are the many cases where the text had become slightly corrupt. In a considerable number of the examples which follow, the difficulty with the word was due solely to the confusion of ל and י by copyists; thus, γωληλα for גיא לילה, μεθωσειμ for בתייהשים. In other cases, two of the letters of the Hebrew word had become accidentally transposed; thus αβεδηρειμ for הדברים, μεθαχαβειμ for בתיחבאים, αμασσειθ for השבט, γαβης for ענב.⁷ In the most of these cases of text-corruption, the true reading was not hard to find, and almost any translator would have made the emendation for himself. It is eminently characteristic of Theodotion and his method that he refused to take any such responsibility. Then, finally, there are the perfectly well-known words, such as αυ, γαι, γαν, μαναα, regarding whose exact meaning or use in certain passages the translator may have been in doubt.⁸ Concerning the occasional procedure of Theodotion in such cases, see again Field

⁷ Of course, such instances as these and the preceding ones would generally *not* be recorded by the ancient collectors of Hexaplaric readings. The fact that they originated in mere blunders was apparent.

⁸ In the case of the transliteration φεα, for פהא, "governor," it may be that Theodotion evaded the translation because he was not quite satisfied with any of the ordinary readings of the word: στρατηγός, ἑπαρχος, ἄρχων, ἡγεμών; or because he did not wish to take the responsibility of choosing among them. It is perhaps worthy of remark, in this connection, that in the Greek of Hag. 1:1, 14, the word פֶּהַת is not rendered at all.

and Swete, in the places named. One must agree with Field, that there are some instances in which it is impossible for us to find any sufficient excuse for the transliteration.

The following is the list:⁹

1. *αββους* (see no. 37).
2. *αβεδη* Ezr. 2:58. For עֲבָדֵי, "servants." In the phrase עֲבָדֵי שְׁלֹמֹה, the name Solomon was not recognized: *υἱοὶ αβεδη Σελμα*, hence the עֲבָדֵי was cautiously transliterated. It was certainly not thought of as forming part of a proper name. (L has *υἱοὶ τῶν δούλων Σαλομων*: two alterations.)
3. *αβεδηρειμ αθουκειμ* I Chron. 4:22. MT הַדְּבָרִים עֲתִיקִים, "the words are ancient."
4. *αβειρα* Neh. 1:1. הַבִּירָה, "the palace." So 7:2, *βειρα*. (L has *βάρης* in both places.)
5. *αγγαι* II Chron. 26:9; in the L text only. For הַגֵּיאַ, "the valley." See also no. 29, and below, p. 74.
6. *αγουγειμ* II Chron. 9:10; in three cursives only; see below, p. 75. MT אֲלִנְיָוִים (but in I Kings 10:11 f. אֲלִמְיָם), "algum wood."
7. *αδωρηεμ* Neh. 3:5. MT אֲדִירֵיהֶם, "their nobles." (L: *οἱ ἰσχυροὶ αὐτῶν*.)
8. *αθερσαθα* Ezr. 2:63; Neh. 7:65, 70. For הַתְּרַשָּׁתָא (title).
9. *αθουκειμ* (See no. 3.)
10. *αιλαμ* II Chron. 3:4. MT אוֹלָם, "porch."
11. *αιν* Neh. 2:14; 12:37; in the latter passage the MSS have *αἰνέιν*. For עֵין, "spring." (L has in both cases *τῆς πηγῆς*.)
12. *αλημωθ* I Chron. 15:20. MT עֲלִמֹת. (L: *περὶ τῶν κρυφίων*, as in the Psalm-superscriptions.)

⁹The orthography varies considerably in the MSS, and I record usually only one form, without wasting time over the vain attempt to determine the original. Of course the variations between *ι* and *ει*, *αι* and *ε*, etc., have no significance whatever, and are rarely of any use even in determining groups of manuscripts. Scribes were free to exchange them at pleasure, and did so. As *ει* is used most commonly (though not consistently) for the long *ι* sound in our best-known uncials, I have adopted it. The plural endings *-ειμ* and *-ειν* (the latter apparently later and due to the influence of spoken Aramaic) are also frequently exchanged in the MSS.

13. *αμασενειθ* I Chron. 15:21. MT *הַשְּׁמִינִית*. (L: *περὶ τῆς ὁγδόης*; cf. Ps. 6:1; 12:1.)
14. *αραα* I Chron. 2:52. For *הַרְאָה* (MT *הַרְאָה*, "the seer"). It seems impossible to determine whether Theodotion regarded this as a proper name, or not. The original rendering here seems to have been: ⁵²*καὶ ἦσαν υἱοὶ τῷ Σωβαλ πατρὶ Καριαθιαριμ αραα εσει Αμμανιωθ*, ⁵³*υμασφεωθ Καριαθιαειρ, Αιθαλειμ, Αιφειθειμ, κ.τ.λ.* See nos. 38 and 63.
15. *αριηλ* I Chron. 11:22. MT *אַרְיֵאֵל*, which Theodotion certainly did not regard as a proper name. (L inserts *υἱοῦς*, from the Greek of II Sam. 23:20.)
16. *ασαφειμ* I Chron. 26:15, 17. MT *אֶסְפִּים*, "stores."
17. *αφφουσωθ* II Chron. 26:21. MT (*ketib*) *הַפְּשׁוּת*, "separateness."
18. *αχεχαρ* Neh. 3:22. For *הַחֶפֶר*, "the circuit." (L: *τοῦ πρωτοτόκου*, corrected from a reading *הַבְּכָר*.)
19. *αχουχ* II Chron. 25:18 (twice). For *הַחֹחַ*, "the thistle."
20. *βααλτααμ* Ezr. 4:8, 9, 17. For *בַּעַל טַעַם*, "reporter of news."
21. *βαθων* (A *βαδων*, L *βατων*) Ezr. 7:22. For *בִּיתֵין*, "baths" (the liquid measure).
22. *βακχουρίους* Neh. 13:31. For *בְּכוֹרִים*, "firstfruits." (L: *πρωτογενήμασιν*.)
23. *βαμα* I Chron. 16:39; 21:29; II Chron. 1:13. For *בִּמְה*, "high place."
24. *βειρα* (See no. 4.)
25. *βεν* for *בֶּן*, "son," in compounds: I Chron. 11:34, *Βενε Ασαμ*, for *בְּנֵי הַשֵּׁם* (see below, p. 74); see also no. 33.
26. *βηθ*- for *בֵּית*, "house," in cases where it is evidently a separate word: Neh. 3:16, *βηθ αγαβαριμ בית הַגְּבָרִים*; 3:20 f., *βηθ ελιασουβ בית אֱלִישִׁיב* (Eliashib named in this very verse as the high priest, and cf. vs. 1); 3:24, *βηθ αζαρια בית עזריה*; 3:31, *βηθ ανναθινειμ בית הַנְּתִינִים*, cf. vs. 26! (In all of these cases, L translates the word *בֵּית*.)

27. *γαβης* I Chron. 4:9. From a reading כַּעֲבֹץ, rendered ὥς *γαβης*, where MT has בַּעֲצָב, "in pain." (L: ἐν δια-
πτώσει.)
28. *γαζα* Ezr. 5:17; 6:1; 7:20. For גִּזְזָא, "treasure."
29. *γαι* Neh. 2:15, in the L text and the cursive 121; 3:13, in L only. For גַּי, "valley." See also no. 5, and below, p. 74.
30. *γαν οζα* II Chron. 36:8. For גַּן עֶזְא, "the garden of 'Uzza." The passage containing these words is wanting in MT, and also in I Esdras, but certainly stood in the Hebrew text from which Theodotion translated; see further below. The phrase occurs also in II Kings 21:18, 26, where it is rendered (in *all* the Greek texts) ἐν τῷ κήπῳ Οζα.
31. *γασβαρηνός* Ezr. 1:8. For גִּזְבָּר, "treasurer." The termination -*ηνος* suggested by *γαζαρηνός* (for גִּזְרָא), Dan. 5:7, 11, 15, etc.?
32. *γεδδουρ* I Chron. 12:21. For גִּדְדִּיר, "troop." (The same transliteration—origin unknown—in one of the texts of I Sam. 30:8. It may well be doubted whether the ascription, by the cursive 243, of the rendering *συστρέμματος* to Theodotion, in I Sam. 30:8, is correct. Notice the similar mistake—this time concerning Aquila—recorded in Field's *Hexapla* on II Sam. 3:22, in regard to this same word. May not the transliteration be Theodotion's in all these places?)
33. *γη βεν εννομ* II Chron. 28:3; 33:6. For גֵּיא בֶן הַנֶּחֱם, "the valley of the son of Hinnom." Cf. no. 25; also nos. 5 and 29. (L has ἐν φάραγγι Βενεννομ.)
34. *γωλαθ* II Chron. 4:12, 13. MT גִּלְוֹת, "bowl-capitals." (L: τὰς βάσεις.)
35. *γωληλα* Neh. 2:13. MT גֵּיא לַיְלָה (ה), ("and I went out through the gate of the) valley by night." (L has *γωληλα νυκτός*.)
36. *δαβειρ* II Chron. 3:16; 4:20; 5:7, 9. For דְּבִיר, the "innermost sanctuary" of Solomon's temple. This transliteration is used by others than Theodotion.

37. *εβδαθ αββους* I Chron. 4:21. For עֲבֹדַת הַבִּיץ, “manufacture of fine linen.”
38. *εσει* I Chron. 2:52. For הָצִי, “half.” Immediately below, in vs. 54, the word is translated; cf. no. 63. (The passage is lacking in the L text, which omits—because of homoeoteleuton—the last three words of vs. 52 and the first three words of vs. 53. In both A and B the passage is badly miswritten; see no. 14.)
39. *εφουδ* I Chron. 15:27. For אֶפֶד, “ephod.” (L: ἐν στολῇ βυσσίνῃ.) The transliteration occurs outside of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh.
40. *ζακχω* I Chron. 28:11, 20. MT, in vs. 11, כְּנֹזָיו,¹⁰ “its treasuries.” (L, in both verses: τῶν ἀποθηκῶν αὐτοῦ.) In MT the word and its context are missing in vs. 20, though they must have stood there originally—a fact which seems to have been generally overlooked. Neither in his *Polychrome Chronicles* (1895) nor in his *Bücher der Chronik* (1902) does Kittel discover that our Hebrew text has accidentally lost a considerable passage (more than a dozen words) at this point. Benzinger (1901) does no better. This is a good illustration of the way in which “the Septuagint” is commonly used. The passage in the Greek, in its original form, reads as follows: καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ ζακχω αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ὑπερῶα καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας τὰς ἐσωτέρας καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα οἴκου Κυρίου. The necessity of this to its context is apparent from vs. 21 compared with vss. 11–13. The omission in the Hebrew of MT was caused by homoeoteleuton, the passage being preceded by עֲבֹדַת בֵּית יְהוָה and ending with תַּבְנִית בֵּית יְהוָה. The translator, then, actually wrote this word ζακχω twice.
41. *θαννουργειμ* Neh. 3:11; 12:38. For תַּנּוּרִים, “furnaces.” Neh. 12:38 is wanting in the codices A B א, but is present in many cursives and in the L text, and was included in Theodotion’s translation. See further below.

¹⁰It is possible that the original transliteration was γανζακχω, and that the first syllable was corrupted to τῶν (as in cod. B in vs. 11), which was subsequently dropped.

42. *θεραφεῖμ* II Chron. 35:19. For תרפים, "teraphim"—but the Hebrew original of this passage is now lost; see no. 44. This transliteration is used by others than Theodotion.
43. *θωδαθα* (most MSS, including all the uncials, *θωλαθα*; an early blunder, Λ for Δ) Neh. 12:27. For תודות, "thanksgivings." (L: (ἐν) ἀγαλλιάσει.)
44. *καδησεῖμ* (? So cod. 121; the others have *καρεσεῖμ*¹¹) II Chron. 35:19. For קדשים, "temple-prostitutes." The passage, which is a highly important one for the history of our Hebrew text, is found neither in MT nor in I Esdras. See below, p. 83. Observe that Theodotion has the transliteration *καδησεῖμ* in Judg. 5:21.
45. *κεφφουρη* I Chron. 28:17; Ezr. 1:10; 8:27. For כפורי, "cups."
46. *κοθωνοί* Ezr. 2:69. For כתנות, "robes." (L: *στολὰς ἱερὰτικὰς*.) See also no. 69.
47. *λαμ(μ)αανε* II Chron. 22:1. All our Greek texts are corrupt here. For לַמְּחָנָה, "for a raid."¹² Some justification for Theodotion's transliteration here may be found in the ambiguity of the expression, which I believe to have been mistranslated by every modern scholar as well as in the ancient versions. This strange word, *λαμ(μ)αανε*, immediately following οἱ Ἀραβες, was of course supposed to be a proper name, and was accordingly made, by some copyist, to end with a s. *αλαμααanes* became *αλαμαζονες*, a form attested by several MSS. A and B have [οἱ Ἀραβες οἱ] *αλιμαζονεις*.¹³ (L: *καὶ τῶν Ἀμαζονιευμ ἐν τῇ*

¹¹The Greek letters δ and ρ are frequently confused by scribes; some other examples will be given in the sequel. There is therefore room for doubt as to the original form of this transliteration. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, on II Chron. 35:19, prints: "*καρα(ι)σειμ* = קדשים" (*sic*); but in this he is certainly mistaken.

¹²Cf. לַעֲבֹא, "for war," "to give battle," the use of the verb חָנָה, "to attack," in Ps. 53:6; I Macc. 5:49 f., etc., and of מְחָנָה in II Chron. 18:33 = I Kings 22:34, etc.

¹³Hence in 14:14 (15) the gloss, τοὺς Ἀμαζονεῖς (!), derived solely from the passage 22:1, has come into the Greek text (all recensions). Benzinger, *Commentary* on Chron., would emend the Hebrew text of 14:13 f. accordingly. But there is no excuse for "emending;" the context shows, as plainly as a context can show anything, that עֲרִים is right as it stands. The connection between the two passages would be made by any reader; the enemies of Israel in both cases are the Philistines and the neighboring Arabs.

παρεμβολῆ, a characteristic specimen of the crimes committed by this recension.)

48. *μαναα* II Chron. 7:7; Neh. 13:5, 9. For מִנְחָה, "meal offering." (L substitutes in each case the word *θυσία*.) Observe that in Dan. 2:46 Theodotion has *substituted* this transliteration for the older translation *θυσίας*.
49. *μασαναι* II Chron. 34:22. For בְּשֵׁנָה, "the second (district)."
50. *μεθαχαβειμ* (the correct reading in codd. 56, 121) I Chron. 21:20. For מִתְחַבְּאִים, "hiding themselves." (L: *πορευομένους*, a reading which evidently originated in a corruption of the *κρυβόμενοι* which most MSS have here.)
51. *μεθωεσειμ* Ezr. 2:62. For מִתְּחִישִׁים, "listed by genealogy." (L: *γενεαλογούντες*.)
52. *μετεβααθ* (?) I Chron. 18:8. For מִשְׁבַּתָּה, "from Tībhāt" (name of a city). It is evident from the way in which the following word is translated that Theodotion did not regard this as a proper name. L has *ἐκ τῆς ταβααθ*, translating the preposition; and this translation (evidently secondary) has also found its way into the Egyptian text: A, *ἐκ τῆς ματεβεθ*; B, *ἐκ τῆς μεταβηχας*.¹⁴
53. *μεχωνωθ* II Chron. 4:14, twice. For מְכוֹנֹת, "bases." Observe that Theodotion gives us this same transliteration in Jer. 27:19 (Greek 34:15).
54. *ναχαλη* I Chron. 11:32. For נַחֲלֵי, "wadys" (?).
55. *οφαλ* II Chron. 27:3; 33:14; Neh. 3:26, 27; 11:21. For עֶבֶל(ה), the "hill" in Jerusalem.
56. *σαβαχωθ* II Chron. 4:12; only in the cursives 56 and 121; see below, p. 75. For שְׂבָכוֹת, "nets."
57. *σαχωλ* (? A *σαχων*, B *σαχωχ*. The reading of the cod. Basiliano-Vaticanus, N [XI in H. and P.] is given as *ασιβιβασαχωλ* (!); the first part of this being probably the proper name *Ασεβεια*, from the beginning of vs. 19?) Ezr. 8:18. For שְׂכֵל, "prudence." (L has [*ἀνῆρ*] *συνετός*.)
58. *σερσερωθ* II Chron. 3:16. For שְׁרָרֹת, "chains." (L: *άλυσιδωτά*.)

¹⁴It is a mistake to suppose that the *χ* of this form is the transliteration of מ. It is merely one of the customary blunders of codex B. *μετεβααθ* was miswritten *μεταβχαθ* (*χ* for *α*, several other examples are given in the sequel), and so on.

59. σοομ I Chron. 29:2. For שֹׁהַם, name of a stone. (L: [λίθους] ὄνυχος.)
60. σωφαρ I Chron. 15:28. For שׁוֹפָר, "trumpet."
61. σωφ[ε]ρειμ I Chron. 2:55; in the L text only; see below. For סופרים, "scribes."
62. τεκχειμ II Chron. 9:21; in the L text only; see below. For תוכים, "peacocks."
63. υμασφεωθ I Chron. 2:53. For וּמִשְׁפְּחוֹת, "and the families (of)." The same word is translated in vs. 55, just below—the context there being so plain as to leave even Theodotion no room for doubt! (The L text has accidentally lost the first words of vs. 53; see Nos. 14 and 38. Both A and B are corrupt here.)
64. φασεχ II Chron. 30:1, and often. For פֶּסַח, "passover." The *old* Greek version of the Chronicler's history had πάσχα; see II Chron. 35:1, 6–13, 16–18, in I Esdras (1:1, 6 ff., 16–19). The large number of occurrences of the word in these two chapters of the Theodotion version was what kept it from being changed, even in the L recension. See also above, p. 61, note.
65. φεα (?) Neh. 5:14, 15, 18; in the Egyptian text only. For פֶּהָ, "governor." The word occurs four times in these three verses, and appears at first sight to have been transliterated three times and translated once. This would be a truly Theodotionic proceeding; still, it is perhaps more likely that the word was originally transliterated in all four cases. At present, through accidental corruption and attempted correction, the forms originally written have been nearly obliterated; only close scrutiny can find the trace of them. The Egyptian text of the verses in question now reads: ¹⁴ Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἐνετείλατό μοι εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν (פֶּהָ) . . . ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου βίαν αὐτῶν (לָחֶם הַפֶּהָ) οὐκ ἔφαγον, ¹⁵ καὶ τὰς βίας (הַפֶּהָ) τὰς πρώτας ἃς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐβάρυναν ἐπ' αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ. . . . ¹⁸ . . . καὶ σὺν τούτοις ἄρτους τῆς βίας (לָחֶם הַפֶּהָ) οὐκ ἐζήτησα. The Greek yields in each of these clauses a passable sense, the word βία

meaning "extortion" or "fruit of extortion." But the latter phrase would be a singularly free rendering (!) even of *לחם הפתה*, especially for Theodotion; and at the beginning of vs. 15 and the end of vs. 18 it is quite plain that *βία* stands simply as the equivalent of *פחה*.¹⁵ Beyond question, Theodotion wrote *φea* in these three cases (at least); by one of the most common of scribal errors this became *βea*; the rest followed naturally. The original readings were presumably: in vs. 14, *ἄρτον τοῦ φea*, instead of *βίαν αὐτῶν*;¹⁶ vs. 15, *φewθ* instead of *βίας*; vs. 18, *ἄρτον τοῦ φea* instead of *ἄρτον τῆς βίας*. (The L text has substituted translations in each of the three cases: *ἄρτον τῆς ἡγεμονίας* in vss. 14 and 18, and *ἄρχοντες* in vs. 15.)

66. *χαμανειμ* Ezr. 8:27. The source of this is the word *לִדְרַחְמִים* (MT. *לְאֹדְרַחְמִים*), "in drachmas," which was divided *לִדְרַחְ* and characteristically rendered *ἐς τὴν ὁδὸν χαμανειμ*. (In cod. A this has been improved to *ε. τ. ὁ. δραχμωνειν*; while in the L text the correction has gone still farther, changing the last word to *δραχμάς*.)
67. *χερουβειμ* II Chron. 3:8 ff., and elsewhere. For *כְּרִיבִים*, "cherubim." This transliteration is not peculiar to Theodotion.
68. *χεχχαρ* (?) I Chron. 16:3; only in the L text, which reads *χελχαρ*, presumably because of a common scribal error in the Greek. For *כֶּפֶר*, "loaf." A and B have *ἄρτον*. Cf. No. 18, where the same word (meaning "circuit"), written with the article, is transliterated by *αχεχαρ*.
69. *κοθωνωθ* Neh. 7:70, 72. For *כְּתָנוֹת*, "robes." Very likely the *κοθωνοί* (?) of Ezr. 2:69 (above, No. 46) originated in this same transliteration. (L, in all three cases, *στολὰς ἱερατικὰς*.)
70. *χωθαρεθ* (-ωθ?) II Chron. 4:12 (twice), 13. For *כְּתָרוֹת*, "capitals."

¹⁵ So it is given, in fact, in both Schleusner and Tromm. Klostermann, among modern scholars, has recognized the fact of a transliteration.

¹⁶ How easy the corruption of *ἄρτον* to *αὐτῶν* would be may be seen from vs. 15, where codex A has *αὐτοῖς* for *ἄρτοις*.

The regularity with which these words are distributed through the history is worthy of notice. Leaving out of account the repetition of such frequently used words as *φασεχ* and *χερουβειμ*, the number of occurrences in I Chron. is 28; in II Chron. 32; in Ezra 16; and in Neh. 30.

To those who have examined Theodotion's transliterations in connection with the other extant traces of his work, this list will be conclusive. The large number of these words, and their characteristics in detail, added to the facts which have already been noticed, place the matter quite beyond the reach of doubt. It is to be remarked also that a few of the words in the list are already known from other sources to have been used by this translator; such are *καδησειμ*, *μαναα*, *μεχωνωθ*, *φασεχ*, and probably *γεδδουρ*. To make the demonstration still more complete, it is further to be observed that in the few points of contact between the Theodotion element in Daniel and our Greek translation of the Chronicler's work there are some striking instances of identical usage. One of these is the case of the word *μαναα*, noticed above. Another is the use of *λίψ* (a favorite word with Theodotion) as the rendering of *נִיעַרְב*; found only in II Chron. 32:30; 33:14; Dan. 8:5; in the last-named passage substituted for the *ἀπὸ δυσμῶν* of the older version, which certainly needed no correction! Equally striking is the substitution of *εὐώδιαι*, as the rendering of *נִיחֻדִּיךְ*, in Ezr. 6:10 and Dan. 2:46; in both cases correcting the *σπόνδαι* of the older translation. Notice also the peculiar rendering *ἀπὸ μέρους* for *בְּקֶצֶת*, only in Dan. 1:2 and Neh. 7:70; the use of the verb *συνερίζειν*, and that of the noun *ἐγκαίνα*. Undoubtedly other examples of the kind can be found; I have made no thorough search.

In the case of gentile names, it is Theodotion's custom to transliterate exactly, instead of using the Greek adjective endings. The latter, however, have been substituted later in a good many instances, sometimes in the Egyptian text and very often in L. Thus, in Neh. 2:19 the original rendering had *ὁ Ἀρωνει*, *ὁ Ἀμμωνει*, and *ὁ Ἀραβει*; where L offers *ὁ Ὀρωνίτης*, *ὁ Ἀμμωνίτης*, and *ὁ Ἀραψ*. An example of a passage in which nearly all the Greek texts have made the change is Ezr. 3:7, where for "Sidonians and Tyrians" cod. 121 has *Σιδανιμ* and *Σωριμ* (probably

almost exactly what Theodotion wrote); B has *Σηδαμειν* and *Σωπειν*; all the other MSS have substituted the Greek adjective forms. Many other instances of the kind could be given.

In some cases where Theodotion was in doubt whether the word before him was a gentile name or not, he cautiously reproduced the Hebrew article by the Greek *ἀ*. In such cases it was inevitable that those who cared for the Greek text should often have taken the further step of substituting the Greek article. For example, in *Ezr.* 2:57 Theodotion wrote *υἱοὶ Φασ(ε)ραθ* (or *Φαχεραθ*?) *ασεβωειμ* (הַצִּבְיִים), as is attested by the Egyptian Greek tradition. But in the L text we find *υἱοὶ Φακεραθ τῶν Σαβωειμ*. Of course accidental corruption of these unfamiliar forms took place from time to time. Thus, in *I Chron.* 18:17 *τοῦ Χερηθι* was Theodotion's rendering. I was miswritten for X, as occasionally elsewhere, and in a cursive manuscript *θ* became *ω*, as in a great many other places. Hence the *τῶν ἱερέων* in both L and the ordinary Egyptian text (but not in A).

It remains to be said in general, regarding Theodotion's transliterations (and especially those of ordinary nouns), that in all probability some of them, and perhaps a considerable number, have been lost. Of course, in a version which came into common use as a part of the Greek Bible, these uncouth words were very soon felt to be seriously disturbing, especially in the many cases where the Hebrew word and its meaning were perfectly well known. We should therefore suppose that the process of removing these peculiar creations of Theodotion would have begun almost immediately. We can see the process going on in the texts which are known to us. In the Lagarde recension, it is the rule (not systematically carried through, to be sure) that these transliterations are replaced by translations; and we can see the same tendency actively at work even in the most conservative group of manuscripts. Observe, for example, what has taken place in *I Chron.* 28:17, where the unusual word כַּפּוּר (י) occurs six times. The L recension (!) has preserved Theodotion's *κεφ-φουρ(η)* in three places; cod. A has it once; cod. B has dropped it altogether. Similarly, in *Ezr.* 7:22 *βαθων* "baths" (liquid measure) has been replaced in B by *ἀποθηκῶν*, but not in A; in *Ezr.*

2:69 *κοθωνοι* (so B) becomes in A *χιτώνας*. Or to take the case of a still more common word: in I Chron. 11:34 *בְּנֵי הַיָּשִׁים* is rendered by Theodotion *βεν(ν)αι ασαμ*; this becomes in A and L (but not in ~~Σ~~ B) *υιοι α'*. Many other examples might be given.¹⁷ It is reasonable to suppose that this process had already begun before the period represented by the earliest manuscript testimony which we have. A few of the rejected words, after having been actually dropped from all the texts in common use, were preserved in stray cursives, or rescued again by the L recension (thanks to its conflating tendency).¹⁸ An excellent example is the rendering of the phrase *שַׁעַר הַגֵּיץ* "valley gate" in Neh. 2:15. Here the L text presents both *καὶ ἤμην ἐν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς φάραγγος* and *καὶ διήλθον διὰ τῆς πύλης γαι*, the position of the latter clause showing that in this recension it was inserted later. Something very similar has taken place in II Chron. 26:9, where (in the L text) *αγγαι* and *τῆς φάραγγος* form a doublet, though in this case it is the translation which seems to be secondary. No one but Theodotion would be likely to transliterate in such a case as this; and that it was actually he that did it appears to be rendered certain by Neh. 3:13, where L gives for the same phrase *οὐλῃ τὴν πύλῃν γαι*. But in all three of these passages the word *γαι* has quite disappeared from the manuscripts of the standard text! A case in which the L text has retained a transliteration which has already been dropped by all the MSS of the "Egyptian" group, with the single exception of codex 121, is the word *σωφεριμ*,¹⁹ I Chron. 2:55. In the ordinary text it has been rendered by *γραμματέων*. Another example is

¹⁷ In I Chron. 26:16 it seems to be the case that A has preserved the original rendering, *τῷ Σεφειμ*, for *לשפים*, while the improvement *εἰς δεύτερον* (from a late reading *לשנים*) has been adopted not only by the MSS of the L recension but also by the most of the "Egyptian" MSS, including B. The supposition that A's is the corrected text here would be far less plausible, judging from what has taken place elsewhere in the MSS of these books. L's double rendering here contains an obvious correction according to MT, *לשפים* being translated by *τοῖς προθύροις*.

¹⁸ Hence, presumably, the presence of the word *εναλέμ* in I Chron. 9:18, only in L. Whence it comes I do not know, but it is probably a corrupt form of one of Theodotion's transliterations. The *eva* is pretty certainly a reproduction of the *הַפָּה* which stands here in the Hebrew; the remainder may be due to dittography of some sort, involving the following *ἐν*. No one of the commentators on Chronicles appears to have noticed it.

¹⁹ It appears in various forms: *σωφηρεμ* in 93, 108, and 121; *σωφιριμ*, in 19; *σωπεριμ* in the retransliteration from an Armenian codex given in H. & P. Lagarde edits *σωφριμ*.

the word *χεχχαρ*, I Chron. 16:3. Other words of this nature which have narrowly missed oblivion are *τεκχειμ*, II Chron. 9:21, preserved in L; *αγουγειμ*, II Chron. 9:10, found in one L MS, 93, and (in the form *γουγειμ*) in the cursives 56 and 121; and *σαβαχωθ*, II Chron. 4:12, preserved only by 56 and 121. These words are given by Field in his list (*loc. cit.*, pp. xl f.) as of "anonymous" origin; but it must now be evident, I think, that they are survivals from Theodotion's version.

In other parts of the Old Testament, moreover, traces of Theodotion's transliteration, hitherto unrecognized as his, are undoubtedly to be found. His version must have been felt to be an indispensable one, meeting a greater variety of needs than any other, and its influence upon the standard Greek text was probably much greater than we ordinarily suppose. Its readings must have supplanted the other renderings in many places,²⁰ and as an inevitable result, the ascription of "Theodotion" readings to "LXX," and *vice versa*, was not infrequent. This happened even in the case of transliterations, passages containing them having been taken over into the current version at an early date, particularly in the books Sam.—Kings, in which the textual tradition made so many difficulties. One example of the kind has already been given; see above, on *γεδδουρ*. Precisely similar in their history, as I believe, are the four other renderings given by Field (*loc. cit.*, p. xlii) as cases in which "LXX" transliterates while Theodotion translates. One of these, for example, is II Sam. 17:19 *הרפוח*, rendered "LXX *αραφωθ*, Theod. *παλάθας*." Another is II Kings 16:17 *בכנות*, rendered "LXX *μεχωνωθ*, Theod. *ὑποστηρίγματα*." See the note on this latter word in the list above. From the evidence which we already have, it seems to me that we are fully justified in reversing these ascriptions, assuming that in these cases, at least, the later version had contaminated the earlier.

The important question, whether in preparing his version of the Chronicler's history Theodotion was revising an older trans-

²⁰ To take a single example from the Prophets—the one which happens to occur to me at the moment: in Isa. 44:8 we can see the process at work; the phrase *μηδὲ πλανᾷσθε* has been taken over from Theod. into the text of cod. B, but is not in the older text of this verse represented by codd. ANQ, etc. Fortunately the Hexaplar MSS here make the matter perfectly plain.

lation, or not, should probably be answered in the negative. We have as our guide his proceeding in the case of Daniel; and what he does there is to retain to a remarkable degree the wording of his predecessor, in spite of extensive alterations in the form of the text. A comparison of I Esdras with the corresponding part of Theodotion does not show any such close resemblance. The coincidences of rendering seem to be only such as would be expected in two translations of the same Hebrew text, while the differences are so many and so great as to argue strongly against any dependence upon, or even acquaintance with, the older version.²¹ We know of no translation of Chr.-Ezr.-Neh. before the time of Theodotion, other than the one represented by our I Esdras, and it is not likely that there was another. Our last witness to the existence of this version in its completeness comes from Josephus. After his day, so far as I am aware, we meet with it only in the "I Esdras" fragment. Soon after the beginning of the Christian era, in all probability, the old Greek version of the Chronicler's history disappeared from the face of the earth, with the exception of the one fragment which happened to be rescued from a single codex (see *AJSL*, p. 141). This fragment may have escaped Theodotion's notice altogether, or he may not have thought it of importance for his purpose. At all events, when he put forth his own translation, it had a clear field; and as a matter of course, it was soon adopted as a part of "the Septuagint" and its authorship was quite forgotten. If it is indeed an independent translation of these books, as I believe, it is doubly important as the one great example of the methods of this interpreter, this time not a mere reviser, but free to work in his own way.

III. THE TWO MAIN TYPES OF THE TEXT

1. *First Esdras*

I have described briefly in one of the preceding essays (*AJSL*, pp. 136-41) the two differing "editions" of the Chronicler's history which are known to us, giving some account of their origin.

²¹ Why, to take a single instance, should Theodotion have rendered the word אָנָה (MT אֲשֶׁרָה) in Ezr. 5:3 by the senseless *χορηγίαν*, if he had known that it had already been rendered (I Esdr. 6:4) by the obviously suitable *στέγην*?

Since an interval of 300 years lay between them, and the later edition was, generally speaking, independent of the former one, the comparison of them is obviously a matter of great importance for purposes of textual criticism. But before they can be thus used in any satisfactory way, it is necessary to know to a considerable extent the history of their transmission; the state of preservation of the various texts; the age, the character, and the trustworthiness of the translations; the relative excellence and mutual relations of manuscripts. The following observations will serve as a beginning.

The old Greek translation of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. was made not long before the middle of the second century B. C. The direct evidence of this is found in the quotation from the Greek historian Eupolemus, in a work composed about 150 B. C. (see Schürer, *Geschichte*³, III, 351 f.). The historian is telling of the building of Solomon's temple, and quotes from the letter of Hiram, king of Tyre, in the form of it which is found only in II Chron., chap. 2. The text of the passage, corresponding to II Chron. 2:12 ff., is given in Swete's *Introduction*, p. 370, and reads as follows: *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὃς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔκτισεν, ὃς εἴλετο ἄνθρωπον χρηστὸν ἐκ χρηστοῦ ἀνδρός . . . : καὶ ἀρχιτέκτονά σοι ἀπέσταλκα ἄνθρωπον Τύριον ἐκ μητρὸς Ἰουδαίας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δάν.* Here is, beyond all question, a somewhat free citation from a Greek version of Chronicles. There is every reason to believe, and no reason to doubt, that this translation was the same one of which a part has survived in the "I Esdras" fragment.²² All the evidence which we have seems to show that the I Esdras translation was made as early as the second century B. C. Some of the indications of this nature have already been mentioned; others will appear in the sequel.

The home of the translation may well have been Egypt. There is one interesting fact, at least, which seems to show that

²² It might seem useless to attempt to argue from the wording of so free a citation as this one evidently is. But the opening phrase, "Blessed be the God who made heaven and earth," seems to have been transferred verbatim, and it is at least interesting to observe that we have here one of the characteristic marks of difference between the rendering of Theodotion and that of the old Greek version. Theodotion has the phrase before him in this passage and in Neh. 9:6, and both times renders by *ἐποίησεν* (Heb. עָשָׂה). In I Esdr., the words are found only in 6:12, and the rendering there, as here, is by *κτίζειν* (a form of the Aramaic verb עֲבַד being read).

the translator lived among people to whom the geography and history of Syria were somewhat unfamiliar. The technical term עבר הנהר (Aram. עבר נהרה), "the district beyond (west of) the river (Euphrates)," is in every instance—14 times in all—rendered by Κοίλη Συρία καὶ Φοινίκη, "Coele-Syria and Phoenicia," a rendering which occurs nowhere else.²³ The term "beyond the river" was one which had long been familiar throughout Palestine and Syria, and Theodotion's rendering, πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ, would have been understood anywhere between Judea and Persia. But in Egypt the phrase was not so well known.

From the materials which we have, we are well able to judge as to the character of the translation. It is a faithful rendering, of the kind to which we are accustomed in the older parts of the Greek Old Testament. The translator has a wide knowledge of Greek, uses a large vocabulary, and very often chooses Greek idioms instead of simply copying the Semitic forms of speech. In rendering two verbs connected by "and," for example, he frequently employs the participle for one of the two, where Theodotion and his kind would follow the original. On the other hand, he generally sticks desperately to a corrupt text, hesitating at no nonsense in "translating" it. His performances in really difficult places—and in many that are not difficult at all—are like those of a modern schoolboy, and we may expect to find at least a few stupid blunders (so they seem to us) on every page. This is fortunate, for it enables us, here as elsewhere, to see what Semitic words and phrases the Greek was trying to render. One who is thoroughly familiar with Hebrew and Aramaic and also with the habits of

²³ It is important to observe that this is the old and official terminology used by the Greek historians and geographers from the fourth century onward. "Coele-Syria and Phoenicia," or even "Coele-Syria" alone, included the whole Syrian province west of the Euphrates, i.e., exactly עבר הנהר. An Alexandrian translator of the second century B. C. would have been sure to use it; see II Macc. 3:5, 8; 4:4 for a striking illustration; and cf. also I Macc. 10:69, and the numerous passages in Polybius cited by Holscher. "Palästina in der persischen und hellenistischen Zeit," in Sieglin's *Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographic*, Heft 5 (1903), pp. 7 f. Notice also that "Coele-Syria and Phoenicia" is the term used in the petition of Onias to Ptolemy Philometor, Josephus, *Antt.*, xiii, 3, 1. This terminology went out of general use before the beginning of the Christian era. Strabo, xvi, 2, 2, notes that according to a nomenclature which some (ἐνιοὶ δὲ) had used, "Coele-Syria" included the territory of the Jews, Edomites, and Philistines. His testimony shows that in the last century B. C. and thereafter "Coele-Syria" was ordinarily applied only to the district between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. Thus Holscher, p. 12. His conclusion is the same one which I had myself reached.

these translators will generally be able to see what text lay behind this version—after he has once determined the original form of the Greek.

The Semitic text thus rendered seems to have been not particularly good, but one which had suffered considerably from careless copyists. In many cases, indeed, its readings are manifestly superior to those of our massoretic text, and there is no place in which its help can safely be dispensed with; but on the whole, the type of text which it represents is inferior to that represented by our canonical books. Aside from all the accidental corruption which it has suffered through careless transmission, it seems now and then to have been deliberately “revised,” as, for example, in the opening verses of the section dealing with the official correspondence in the time of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, I Esdr. 2:15. Wherever the probabilities are otherwise evenly balanced, in the conflict of I Esdras readings with those of our canonical recension, the latter has the presumption in its favor. Some instances of the occasional wide divergence of the I Esdras text from that which later became the standard will be given below.

Several scholars have called attention to a certain resemblance between the Greek of I Esdras and that of the old (“LXX”) version of Daniel. See Swete’s *Introduction*, pp. 48 f., and Lupton’s preface to his First Esdras, in the *Speaker’s Commentary*. Most noticeable is the occurrence of the same phrase, *καὶ ἀπηρείσατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλίῳ αὐτοῦ*, in both I Esdr. 2:9 and Dan. 1:2, as has been observed. I add one or two other noteworthy examples.²⁴ The phrase “his house shall be made a rub-bish-heap (נִרְבֵּל),” which occurs in Ezr. 6:11; Dan. 2:5; 3:29, is interpreted by the *old* version in all three places to mean “his house shall be confiscated.” In I Esdr. 6:31 the rendering is: *καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ εἶναι βασιλικά*, and in Dan. 2:5: *καὶ ἀναληφθήσεται ὑμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν*. In Dan. 3:96 he writes: *ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ δημευθήσεται*, which means the same.²⁵

²⁴I give only those which I happen to have noticed and remembered; I have made no search for them.

²⁵So far as I know, the important testimony which these translations (or mistranslations) give to the existence of a Syro-Palestinian root נִרְבֵּל, corresponding to the Arabic نال, ينال, “take, obtain,” has never been noticed. It is the same root whose verb نَرَبَّلُ, jussive) occurs in the last line of the Tabnit inscription, as I hope to show more fully elsewhere.

Again, in Dan. 3:2 we have in the old version (but not in Theodotion) the same list of officers, *σατράπας, στρατηγούς, τοπάρχας καὶ ὑπάτους*, which appears in the same order in I Esdr. 3:14; as also, lacking the last member, in 3:2. Since the Greek words are by no means the settled equivalents of the Aramaic terms, this coincidence can hardly be accidental. Notice also the use of the word *μανιάκης*, "golden chain," in I Esdr. 3:6; Dan. 5:7, 29; the frequent occurrence of *μεγιστᾶνες*, "magnates," in both I Esdras and Daniel; the phrase *ἐποίησε δοχὴν μεγάλην*, I Esdr. 3:1; Dan. 5:1 (not in Theodotion). In Swete's list (*Introduction*, pp. 310 f.) of the unusual Greek words which are found in certain books of the Old Testament, the following also are mentioned as occurring in both I Esdras and the old translation of Daniel: *ἀναπλήρωσις, δογματίζειν, μεγαλειότης, πειθαρχεῖν*.

These instances seem to render one of two conclusions certain: either the old Greek translation of the Chronicler's history strongly influenced that of the book of Daniel; or else both were the work of one and the same translator.²⁶ The latter is the more probable supposition; notice, for instance, how the two passages Dan. 2:5; 3:29, compared with I Esdr. 6:31, prove that the translator worked independently, and was not simply following an older version.

It is not likely that this translation ever circulated widely. The Chronicler's history in its original Semitic form seems to have been little known, and was certainly very little esteemed, in any part of the Jewish world for two or three centuries after the date of its composition.²⁷ From the time when the Story of the Youths was seen to be secondary, and the abridged recension made its appearance, the older, unabridged texts and versions lost ground; and finally, when the official text was created, this old Greek version, already near to extinction, passed out of sight. There is no

²⁶ In that case, the translation of Daniel was probably made soon after the publication of the original, inasmuch as the Chronicler's history was translated *before* the middle of the second century B. C. An early date for the old Greek Daniel is also rendered probable by the Greek version of I Macc. 1:54, in which dependence on the Greek translation of Daniel is certain, as well as the fact that the words quoted had long been familiar.

²⁷ Very likely its true character was well understood, at the first. If that were the case, it would not be surprising that even its one valuable part, the story of Nehemiah, should have made little impression.

evidence that any secondary version was ever made from it, in its entire state, and we know it only from the fragment which survived under the name "First Esdras." The history of the transmission of this fragment, in manuscripts and versions, is unlike that of any other part of the Greek Old Testament, though the old Greek Daniel offers a close parallel in many respects. It has, of course, been far less influenced, in its transmission, by the Hebrew-Aramaic text than its canonical fellows. Their presence beside it has generally saved it from editorial "correction" since the establishment of a standard text, and it is not at all likely to have suffered from such correction before that time. Accordingly, the Hebrew-Aramaic that can be shown to lie behind our I Esdras may generally be accepted as representing a text which existed before the middle of the second century B. C. On the other hand, there is evidence that the Greek text of this translation was somewhat carelessly handled during the first centuries of its existence, and it is easy to be too confident in arguing from the Greek to the Semitic. In dealing with the plus and minus of I Esdras, especially, great caution is necessary.²⁸ Moreover, ever since "*First Esdras*" and "*Second Esdras*" were first placed side by side in manuscripts of the Greek Bible, the danger of contamination, in either direction, has been present; it is remarkable, indeed, that the better types of text should show so little evidence of such corruption. It is only in the L text (see below) that this is a serious matter; there, the contamination of I Esdras has gone so far as to render the text all but useless for critical purposes.

The text of I Esdras, like that of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, is known to us in two principal recensions, which will be described below. The one of these may conveniently be called "Egyptian," and the other "Syro-Palestinian." Of the secondary versions made from the I Esdras Greek, the Syriac, the Ethiopic, and the

²⁸ Not a few of the German scholars who have dealt with I Esdras have relied on the text of Fritzsche (*Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi graece*, 1871). But Fritzsche's eclectic text is built on no sound principles, and his apparatus is untrustworthy at every point. Those very marks—including not only misspellings but also erratic readings—which give the surest critical guidance are habitually omitted by him; while many of the readings of codices A, B, Σ , and others, which he fails to record at all are beyond question the original ones. Those who read the Greek Apocrypha for pastime will find Fritzsche's text comparatively smooth and agreeable; but those who are engaged in exact studies can make no use of it.

Latin are the only ones requiring mention here. The Syriac, made by Paul of Tellā, and the Ethiopic represent the Egyptian recension, and are of considerable value; the Latin, derived from a Syrian text, has also some critical importance. These will receive further mention in the sequel.

2. *The Standard Text of the Second Century A. D.*

The text of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah which was taken as the official one seems to have been carefully selected. It was one from which the Story of the Youths had been cut out, and in which the three wandering chapters of the Ezra narrative were allowed to remain in the book of Nehemiah (*AJSL*, pp. 135 ff.). It was presumably one which bore evidence of being more trustworthy in details than the most of its fellows. So far as we are able to judge, it was, indeed, comparatively "sound," especially in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah; though differing considerably from what the Chronicler originally wrote. The separation of Ezra-Nehemiah from Chronicles had either taken place already, or else was accomplished at this time. When Theodotion made his translation, the division was already effected.

As witnesses to the readings of this "standard" recension we have: (1) the massoretic text; (2) the Greek of Theodotion; (3) the Latin of Jerome. We have the great good fortune to know the habits of each of these two translators, and can thus reason from version to original with an assurance which would not otherwise be possible. As Jerome made his translation near the end of the fourth century, its value for text-critical purposes is very small; it almost everywhere agrees verbatim with our massoretic text. Theodotion's Greek, on the other hand, bears interesting witness to the fact that the massoretic text is by no means identical with the "standard" text of the second century A. D. The manner in which even an official recension can become corrupted, even within a short time, is well illustrated here. The text rendered by Theodotion has suffered many accidental changes, and a few which look like deliberate revision; so also has that of the massoretic. One example of the kind has already been pointed out (above, p. 67); in I Chron. 28:20, Theodotion's Hebrew

contained a passage of considerable length which has been lost, by a mere copyist's error, from our MT.

Another instance, and one of especial interest, is the long passage which in our Greek Bible is appended to II Chron. 35:19 (see above, p. 68). Examination shows²⁹ that this was taken bodily from II Kings 23:24-27; but no one seems to have observed that the borrowing did not take place in the Greek version, but in the Hebrew original. Theodotion had all this before him, in the text which he rendered; moreover, the word קָשִׁים, which he transliterated by *καδησειμ* (?), is not attested in II Kings 23:24 by MT or any version, though it appears to be the older reading as contrasted with the שְׁקִיצִים which is given there. What adds materially to the interest of the case is the fact that the *old* Greek version bears witness to still another Hebrew text at this point. The passage in I Esdras (1:21 ff.) reads as follows: [²¹καὶ ὠρθώθη τὰ ἔργα Ἰωσείου ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ ἐν καρδίᾳ πλήρει εὐσεβείας. ²²καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν δὲ ἀναγγεγραπτεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις, περὶ . . . τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων καὶ ἡσεβηκότων εἰς τὸν κύριον παρὰ πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ βασιλείαν, καὶ ἐλύπησαν αὐτὸν ἐν αἰσθήσει· καὶ οἱ λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου ἀνέστησαν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ. ²³Καὶ μετὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πράξιν ταύτην Ἰωσείου] συνέβη Φαραω βασιλέα κτλ., the end of the bracketed section being the point at which agreement with the other texts begins. The first glance at this Greek version makes the whole matter plain. We have here what the Chronicler himself originally wrote, but in mutilated form, a passage of some length having been lost from the Hebrew by accident at the point where I have inserted the four periods. The Greek translator rendered as well as he could; but the passage was hopelessly spoiled, and indeed made even worse than useless, for as it now reads it seems to class Josiah among the most wicked of kings! Hence the bold measure of cutting out the entire passage from Hebrew texts. In the copy which lay before Theodotion this had been done, and the resulting gap had been filled from II Kings. In our massoretic text the excision has been made and the gap left unfilled; but

²⁹I am not sure to whom it shows anything. Our modern commentators, whether on Chronicles or Esdras, seem to have failed to notice the matter.

certain tell-tale words are added which not only testify eloquently to the fact of the lacuna, but even hint at the nature of the missing passage. When our Hebrew text proceeds (vs. 30): אחרֵי כֵל זֶמַת אֲשֶׁר הֵכִין יֵאֱשִׁיחֵהוּ אֶת הַבַּיִת [עָלָה נָכוּ מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וְגו'] comparison with the two Greek versions shows beyond all question what was meant by the words: "After all this work which Josiah did *in setting the temple in order*." The allusion is to some such passage as the one translated by Theodotion, which immediately preceded these words. And finally, it is to be observed that the "standard text" of the second century A. D. must either have been identical here with Theodotion's, or else have resembled the fragmentary one preserved in I Esdras. The phenomena can be explained on either supposition, but the latter is evidently the more probable one.

A third example of these more important variations in the tradition is found in II Chron. 36:8, another passage in which we are able to compare I Esdras. Here, after the statement that 'the rest of the acts of Jehoiakim are written in the book of Kings,' Theodotion proceeds: [καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰωακείμ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ,³⁰ καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν γαν οὔζα μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ.] καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν κτλ. The bracketed passage is wanting in both MT and I Esdras, but was certainly in the Hebrew text of Chronicles which lay before Theodotion (see above, p. 66). Whatever we may think of its origin—and especially, of the statement regarding "the garden of Uzza"—the fact of its existence ought at least to be made known in our commentaries and "critical" editions of the Hebrew text.

Another example, of a somewhat different character. In the list of returning exiles, found in I Esdr., chap. 5, Ezr., chap. 2, Neh., chap. 7, there is one point at which the accidental omission of two or more names is made especially easy by the proximity of similar or nearly identical forms: הַגְבָּהּ Ἀγαβα and הַגְבֵּי Ἀγαβ, עֶרְבָה and קֶשֶׁב (?). In I Esdr. 5:29 f. we have the passage in what seems to be its original form, with the names Ἀγαβα, Ἀκουβ, Οὐτα, Κηταβ, Ἀγαβ. In Ezr. 2:46 the names Οὐτα, Κηταβ, are

³⁰This clause is found also in II Kings 24:6; and it is customary in both Kings and Chronicles to use this formula in speaking of any king who dies a natural death while occupying the throne.

wanting in all the texts known, and therefore presumably were not found at this point in the official text of the second century A. D., their loss being due to the carelessness of a copyist. In Neh. 7:48 the most of the Greek manuscripts, including codices A and **N**, contain all the names; in MT, and also in a few Greek codices, including B, the last four names of those mentioned above have fallen out accidentally for the obvious reason just given. The names *Ovra* and *Kηταβ*, therefore, which are now not represented anywhere in the Hebrew Old Testament, were present in the Hebrew rendered by Theodotion. It cannot be held that they were inserted from I Esdras, in the Greek translation, because (1) such an insertion is altogether unlikely; (2) if made, it would certainly have been in Ezra, chap. 2, not in Neh., chap. 7; (3) the only form attested by any I Esdras text is *Kηταβ*, while in the Theodotion texts we have everywhere *Kηταρ*. It is remarkable that our commentators and critics of the Hebrew text should not notice the testimony of the Greek in Neh. 7:48. All, apparently, omit even to look at the footnote in Swete; codex B is "the Septuagint."³¹

These illustrations will suffice. The "official" text differed in some important particulars from that of our massoretes and also from the text of Theodotion, although both were derived from it. A satisfactory restoration of it is generally possible, however, by the use of these two, with occasional aid from other sources. Of course the numerous minor variations, due to the usual accidents of transmission and defects of translation, are taken for granted. Sometimes Theodotion, and sometimes MT, has preserved the better reading. The latter deserves the preference, on the whole. The restoration of Theodotion's Hebrew-Aramaic text is in theory a comparatively easy matter, since we know how close a rendering he was wont to make, and since, because of the late date of his work and the nearness of our oldest manuscripts to his time, we can put unusual confidence in the traditional Greek. In fact, however, a good deal of close study is often needed in order to find out what "the traditional Greek" is. And when it has once been

³¹ It is quite characteristic of the L recension that it should expunge these two names both in I Esdras and in Nehemiah—since nothing in the Hebrew corresponds to them!

found, the danger of blundering in constructing from it a new Semitic text is very great, even under these most favorable circumstances.

IV. NOTES ON MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS

Fortunately, the history of the transmission of the three "books," Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, is one and the same history, generally speaking. They have stood side by side, from the first, sharing the same fate, whether in translation or in manuscript tradition. Especially in the Greek codices which contain these books, it can be seen that they all, including I Esdras, have come down to us through the same lines of descent. That which is seen to be true of codex A, or of codex B, or of the grouping of certain cursives, in I Chronicles, for example, will be found to hold good for I Esdras or Nehemiah. That which can be proved regarding a translation, or a recension, in one part of the history will be true, speaking broadly, in every other part.

1. The Superiority of the A Manuscripts to those of the B Group

Theodotion's translation of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. was not made until (at least) the middle of the second century A. D. Our oldest Greek codices date from a time only two or three centuries later than this, and some one or more among them might easily have been copied from manuscripts belonging to the translator's own time. Moreover, these books were already a part of "Sacred Scripture" at the time when the version was made, and the need of a careful tradition of the Greek text was already beginning to be keenly felt. We should therefore expect to find Theodotion's Greek pretty well preserved, in general; and to be able to recognize in some manuscript, or group of manuscripts, a text closely approximating to that which came from the translator's own hands. And in fact, both of these expectations are realized. Thanks to the multitude of proper names in every part of the Chronicler's history, the grouping of manuscripts is relatively easy; and because of Theodotion's many peculiar transliterations, which subsequent editors liked to get rid of, it is often possible to distinguish at a glance the original reading from the later one.

Among the Greek manuscripts, those which contain the L text form a very conspicuous group by themselves. These are the cursives 19, 93, 108, with the occasional addition of others.³² This peculiar recension will be described below, and may be passed over here.

All the other manuscripts may be divided roughly into two main groups. The one of these has for its constant members the uncials B, **Σ**, and N,³³ the cursive 55 (almost an exact duplicate of B), and is supported by the Syro-Hexaplar and Ethiopic versions. The other group is led by the uncial A, and may be said to include all of the remaining cursives, though it must not be inferred from this that the group is homogeneous.³⁴ The characteristic of the manuscripts and versions of the B group is the remarkable fidelity with which they reproduce the archetype from which they all were derived. They carry us back—and evidently not very far back—to a single codex, whose multitudinous errors, including even the most glaring blunders of copyists, are everywhere faithfully repeated. Among these half-dozen witnesses, the best text is given by codex **Σ**, so far as it is preserved; that of codex B is the worst. As for the MSS of the “A group,” they present no such uniform type, but differ among themselves after the usual manner of O. T. Greek MSS, though in relatively slight degree. That is, we find in them just the variety which we should expect to find in a group of codices derived from Theodotion’s translation. The best text in this group is that of codex A.

The current (and, so far as I know, unchallenged) opinion as to the best Greek text of the books Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah is that expressed by Kittel, *Bücher der Chronik*, p. 24, middle: “B hat nun trotz vieler Schreibfehler doch im ganzen den besseren Text, auch bei den Namen, während A sich fast durchweg Angleichung an den MT zu Schulden kommen lässt.”

³² I use, of course, the notation of Holmes and Parsons, wherever the contrary is not expressly stated.

³³ The codex Basiliano-Vaticanus, numbered XI by Holmes and Parsons. It is hardly correct to speak of this manuscript as a “constant” member of the group, to be sure, for in Chronicles and I Esdras it seems to occupy a peculiar position; see below.

³⁴ Certain subdivisions of this main group are obvious enough, but I pass them over here as unimportant for my purposes.

But this view is altogether mistaken. Codex A, in these books, has *not* been conformed to MT; and as for the misguided worship of codex B, it has nowhere so little justification as here. B generally yields an inferior text in the Old Testament, and in this case it is at its very worst.

First, as to codex A. It makes the impression of being surprisingly "correct," *as contrasted with B*. It reads smoothly, as a rule, stands generally pretty close to our massoretic Hebrew, and (what is especially noticeable) does not give in its proper names the monstrosities which are the rule in the other uncials, but rather presents what appears to be a mere transliteration of the MT forms. But this does not show, by any means, that A's is a corrected text. We are not dealing here with the Penta-teuch, or the books of Samuel, or with a translation made in the third century B. C. Theodotion had before him a Hebrew text which very closely resembled our MT; he rendered it exactly, and transliterated very carefully; and we happen to have in codex A a pretty old and unusually trustworthy copy of the original version. That is all. The theory that A has been extensively corrected can be shown on every page and in every chapter to be untenable. The codex contains a great many ancient errors of which the correction is perfectly obvious, but the erroneous readings have in almost all cases been allowed to stand. Take, for example, the numerous transliterations described above (p. 63), where Theodotion dealt timidly with corrupted words which were easily emendable, and which appear in their correct form in MT. Any "edited" text would correct these forms—as they are corrected in L, for example. But in A they remain unchanged. A good illustration, again, from I Esdras is the ancient corruption of the name "Megiddo," in 1:27, where the original Greek reading *Μαγεδδω(ν)* was very early altered, through accidents of a familiar type, to *Μεγαεδδως* and *Μεταεδδους*. Everyone knew what the correct reading was, and in L (but not in A) it was of course substituted. Moreover, in the part of I Esdras which was least of all subject to correction or alteration, the Story of the Youths, the text of A shows the same superiority to that of B as elsewhere. A typical example is fur-

nished by the proper name Ἰδουμαῖοι, "Edomites," in 4:45, 50. In both places A gives it correctly, while B has in the first instance Ἰουδαῖοι, and in the second Χαλδαῖοι.³⁵

In Ezr. 8:10 it is obvious that cod. A and a small group of allied MSS have preserved an ancient reading which stood in the text of Theodotion, but is wanting in MT, L, and the B group alike. MT reads מִבְּנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה; the B and L groups have ἀπὸ νιῶν Σαλειμουθ, or its equivalent. But A and its fellows have ἀπὸ νιῶν Βα[α]νι, Σελειμουθ, which is certainly correct. The name was dropped from the L recension and from the MSS of the B group because (on comparison with MT) the βανι was taken for an unnecessary doublet of νιῶν.

It must always be remembered that A stands in no sense alone. Its text is usually that of the great majority of our MSS.

But what is much more important still is the fact, which is quite obvious in every part of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. and I Esdras, that the cause of the considerable variation in the Greek texts is not correction, but corruption; and that the corrupt forms of proper names, which are especially characteristic of the B group of MSS, were derived directly from the very same (and far more correct) forms which appear in A and its nearest associates. In other words: we have in our MSS the offspring of *only one Greek version* of the three canonical books, namely that of Theodotion; at a short distance from the original, but already considerably disfigured by accidents of transmission, stands A; farther on in the same direction, and with the disfigurement very much increased, follow the MSS of the B group.

The great inferiority of codex B, together with the fact that it represents in general a mere corruption of the A text, may be illustrated here by a few typical examples; others will be given below.

II Chron. 34:22, A Θακουαθ, B Καθουαλ. A's reading agrees neither with MT nor with II Kings 22:14, but undoubtedly represents Theodotion's rendering of תְּקוּוּהָ, as also appears from a comparison of the *qerē* with the *ketib* in our MT.

³⁵ This is a mere correction for Ἰουδαῖοι; cf. codex 55 and the Ethiopic version.

II Chron. 36:8, the transliteration *γανοζα*, mentioned above. A and most MSS have *γανοζαν* (the *ν* from the following letter *μ*, in an uncial text), B *γανοζανη*, with the familiar corruption of N to H.

I Chron. 5:6, 26, for *תגלת פלנזר*, A has both times *Θαγλαθ-φαλνασαρ*; B, in vs. 6 *Θαλγαβανασαρ*, and in vs. 26 *Θαγναφاماσαρ*. This is a fair sample of the difference between A and B throughout the four Chron.-Ezr. books.

I Chron. 1:54 (and Gen. 36:43) for the name *עירם* A has *Ηραμ*, B *Ζαφωειν*! The scribal blunders, mostly made in copying a cursive text, are only those which the B scribes are constantly making. The original transliteration was *αιραμ*. The Z came from the final N of the preceding word; *ιρ* = *φ*, as very often; the confusion of *α* with *ω* can be found on almost every page of B; *μ* becomes *ν*, *νι*, etc. very frequently.

I Chron. 2:47, for the name *גישן*, A has *Γηρσωμ*, B *Σωγαρ*. Neither agrees with MT, and the B reading is a corruption from that of A, as usual.

I Chron. 4:5, for *אשחור*, A *Ασχουρ*, B *Σαρα* (A for X, see below on Neh. 3:2).

I Chron. 4:21, the translit. *εβδαθ αββους*, given correctly in A and in other codices. B has *εφραθ αβακ*. This does not mean at all that B has been corrected according to a reading *עברת*; on the contrary, the confusion of the letters *δ* and *ρ* is a rather common thing in B or its nearest ancestors. Another example of the kind is Ezr. 8:27 *καφουδηθ* (the transliteration, according to B), where A and most of the others have *καφουρη* or its equivalent. In both of these cases, and in others of the same nature, the testimony of the other MSS of the B group shows that we have to do merely with corruption in the Greek text.

Neh. 3:2, B reads *Ζαβαουρ* for MT *זכור*. This certainly seems at first sight to point to a variant Hebrew reading, but it does not in fact. The other MSS of the B group (Σ, V) show that the reading of their archetype was *Ζακχουρ*. The two scribal blunders, B for K and A for X, have each many examples in codex B.

II Chron. 27:3; 33:14. Theodotion's transliteration *οφαλ* was corrupted by one of the very first copyists into *οφλα* (so A and the best of the others); B has in both cases *ὄπλα*, "arms."

Such examples as these could be given by the hundred. And they are simply typical of what is the case in every part of the four books now under discussion.³⁶ Attention should be called, too, to the large number of omissions in codex B, due simply to incredible carelessness. A good example is the very first verse of Ezra, in which three words absolutely necessary to the sense are dropped out. Phrases and whole sentences are lost with surprising frequency; see, for example, in Ezr.-Neh. alone, Ezr. 1:3; 2:10, 39; 3:3; 6:5; 8:5; Neh. 3:4; 7:26 f., 48.

This will suffice to show the character of the manuscript. In Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. and I Esdras, the best uncial, by far, is A; and the worst, by far, is B. It would be hard to find, among the more pretentious MSS of the Greek Old Testament, any other such miserable specimen of textual tradition as that which codex B offers in these particular books. On the other hand, it represents a text which has suffered comparatively little editorial correction. Of course, all of our MSS have been more or less "improved" by the rectification of obvious errors and the substitution of translations for the more disturbing transliterations. Examples of such correction in both A and B have already been given; it has taken place less often in B than in A.

2. *Hexaplar MSS of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh.*

As has already been said (*AJSL*, p. 67), Hexaplar Greek texts of these Old Testament books, Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. and I Esdras, have heretofore been quite unknown. We have the Syro-Hexaplar version of I Esdras, however; and in the first of these

³⁶ If there is any kind of blunder, or confusion of Greek letters, which the transcriber of B (and perhaps also, of its nearest ancestor) did not make repeatedly, I do not know what it is. It is to be hoped that the time may soon come when the authors and editors of works dealing with the Old Testament will cease to load their pages with the textual absurdities of this codex. At present, the custom is all but universal. It might be added, in general, that the recording of obvious blunders in spelling, and of the orthographic habits of unknown scribes (similar habits and peculiarities being already well known) is not a matter of the least scientific interest. The editors of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, for instance, have made their work the repository of thousands of absolutely worthless "variants;" as though it were useful to note the occurrence of both $\Lambda\delta\iota\nu$ and $\Lambda\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$, or as though there could be any text-critical or other value even in the fact that while one codex reads Βεκτελεθ another reads Βαικτελαιθ (the pronunciation being exactly the same in the two cases); to say nothing of recording such rubbish as B's Χθασοδ , from Ελλασδ (all ordinary blunders, even the X; cf. the reading of Σ in Neh. 7:40, etc.) in I Chron. 11:30, or its Βαγαδιηλ , for Βεθδαγων , in Josh. 15:41, or πολέμων , for πόλεων , in I Chron. 18:8, or hundreds of others even worse than these!

essays I have published for the first time the extant fragments of the same version of Nehemiah.³⁷ We therefore have direct access to the "Septuagint" column of Origen's *Hexapla*, not only in I Esdras but also in Nehemiah. Through the general neglect and misunderstanding of I Esdras it has happened that no one has ascertained what Greek MSS are most nearly related to the Syriac, though this can be done with the greatest ease and certainty, thanks to the abundance of proper names. Nestle's astonishing assertion that the Syriac I Esdras was derived "from the Lucian text" (!) has already been noticed. Comparison shows, on the contrary, that the Hexaplar Syriac of both I Esdras and Neh. clings closely at every point to the peculiar text of the B group, which has just been described. That is, *the MSS of the B group are Hexaplar MSS*. This conclusion is confirmed by the much misunderstood note appended to the book of Nehemiah in codex \aleph , written apparently by the original hand.³⁸ The note states that the codex had been carefully collated with one of the oldest and most correct of all existing Hexaplar MSS. But there is in the MS itself no evidence of any considerable diorthosis to which this note could refer. The corrections in the original hand are few and unimportant. The

³⁷ I might have added there, in giving the evidence that this is really the Syro-Hexaplar version, that its transcriber himself explains exactly what is meant by the recurring phrase, "according to the tradition of the Seventy." In a note at the end of the extracts from the book of Daniel (MS Brit. Mus. Add. 12,163, fol. 161b) he says that the version from which all these excerpts are made is that of Paul of Tellā.

³⁸ Thus Swete, in his edition; and the probability seems to me to be strongly supported by the attendant facts. Of course, the task of distinguishing the work of the successive hands in codex \aleph is one of notorious difficulty—often quite hopeless. The matter is further complicated by the considerable additions to the text which have been made by the "second" corrector (\aleph^c), of the seventh century, whose work has been quite generally supposed to be that which is referred to in the note; see Tischendorf's *Vetus Testamentum Graece* (1887), Vol. I, Prolegomena, p. 63; Nestle, *Einführung in das griechische NT*,², p. 51; and compare also the note appended (this time by \aleph^c ?) to the book of Esther in codex \aleph . But the additions of this corrector are of a quite different type. They include: (1) the *plus* of the Hebrew (on which see below); also (2) corrections from the A text, such as those in Neh. 2:16; 7:70, and elsewhere; (3) extensive insertions, mostly worthless doublet readings, from the L recension, such as those in Neh. 1:9, 11; 2:5, 6, 8, etc.; and (4) corrections from still other sources, such as the name of the month in Neh. 1:1, and the word *ἐνοῦχος* in 1:11. It would be plain, even without direct proof, that this variegated material was not derived from Origen's "LXX" column; and the witness of the Syro-Hex. version in 2:5-8 shows conclusively that it was not. This version of Paul of Tellā, it is to be remembered, included everything—even the asterisked matter—which stood in the fifth column of the *Hexapla*. The note at the end of Neh. in \aleph then, if it tells the truth, has nothing to do with the work of the corrector \aleph^c .

necessary conclusion is, that at least in the book of Ezr.-Neh. codex **N** is, and from the first was known to be, a Hexaplar codex; and that care was taken to make it as faithful a replica of Origen's text as possible.³⁹

We can say then with certainty that in both "*First Esdras*" and "*Second Esdras*" (Ezra-Nehemiah) the manuscripts **N**,⁴⁰ B, 55 represent more or less faithful transcripts of the fifth column of the *Hexapla*, and that codex **N**⁴¹ is Hexaplar at least in Ezr.-Neh. It is important to notice, further, that the asterisked passages (Origen's insertions from the *plus* of the Hebrew) are omitted. This fact appears plainly from a comparison of the Greek with the surviving fragments of the Syro-Hexaplar Nehemiah, which contain the *plus*. The B MSS coincide exactly with the Syriac except in this one particular.⁴²

In regard to the B group in Chronicles it is necessary to speak with more caution; but it is hardly to be doubted that here also these same MSS contain the Hexaplar text. The codices **N**, B, and 55, at all events, have the very same character here, and bear the same relation to one another and to the A group, as in the Ezra-Nehemiah books. I have not satisfied myself, thus far, that the same is true of codex **N**; for this, in the majority of the

³⁹ One must of course bear in mind the fact of the remarkable displacement of a portion of codex **N**, and of the MS from which it was copied (the origin of the circumstance having been, probably, the accidental transposition of a single quire), in these very books; and also the possibility that the above-mentioned note was simply transcribed from an older codex. But no one of all these uncertainties can affect the conclusion that **N** is here a Hexaplar MS. That fact is absolutely certain.

⁴⁰ In codex **N**, which is incomplete, I Esdras is now lacking, to be sure. The fact that in certain other books of the *Old Testament* codex B contains, or has affinities with, a Hexaplar text is well known; see Swete's *Introd.*, pp. 487 f.; Cornill, *Einleitung*¹, p. 335.

⁴¹ According to Swete's *Introduction*, pp. 132, 202, this codex does not contain *I Esdras*. What the ground of this statement is, I do not know, and nothing in the literature to which I have access has yielded any explanation. According to Holmes and Parsons, nearly the whole of the last chapter of the book is missing in the codex (XI), but their apparatus includes readings from every other part.

The relation of the text of **N** to that of the *Hexapla* is not a simple one. In Ezr.-Neh. it is plainly based on Origen's; in I Esdras and Chron., on the other hand, it differs so widely as to make one of two suppositions necessary: either it represents an intermediate stage between the older and more correct text of A and the type selected by Origen; or else, it is eclectic. It usually contains old and relatively correct readings, but is plainly related everywhere to the Origen text in a way that is not true of cod. A and its nearest relatives. I have not made any thorough examination, and so cannot speak with confidence.

⁴² In codex **N**, the "second" corrector (**N** c. a.), of the seventh century, has introduced these passages, as well as considerable other material of varied character. See the description of his work in a preceding note.

points at which I have tested it, has seemed to abandon its companions of the B group and to conform to the text of A and its fellows; see above. The investigation is rendered more difficult by the fact that **Σ** is wanting in nearly the whole of Chronicles, while the help of the Syriac and Ethiopic versions is no longer to be had, and the text of B is so corrupt as to render it unfit to be a basis of comparison.

The following passages will serve to show both the relatively poor quality of the Hexaplar text in these books (Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, I Esdras) and also the relative amount of corruption in the several MSS which compose the Hexaplar group. It is often possible to recognize successive stages of degeneration, and in such cases it is almost invariably codex B which occupies the last stage.

Ezr. 10:23, where A and nearly all of the MSS of its "group" have the correct reading:

A, *Κωλιτας καὶ Φεθεια καὶ Ιουδας*

Σ, *Κωλιταν κ. Φααία κ. Ιεδομ*

N, *Κωλιετ κ. Φαδαία κ. Ναδομ*

B, *Κωλιεν κ. Φαδαία κ. Ιοδομ*

Neh. 1:1, A, *Χασσηλουν*; **Σ** and N, *Σεχηηλ*; B, *Σεχηνλου*.

I Chron. 11:12, A (correctly), *Αχωχι*; **Σ**, *Αχωνει*; B, *Αρχωνει*.

I Chron. 11:33 f., Theodotion's original transliteration must have been:

Ελιαβα ὁ Σααλαβωνι, βενε Ασαμ ὁ Γουνι

A, *Ελιαβα ὁ Σαλαβωνι, υἱοῖ*⁴³ *Ασαμ ὁ Γωννι*

Σ, *Εαμαβα ὁ Σωμει, Βεννεας ὁ Σομογεννουνιν*⁴⁴

B, *Σαμαβα ὁ Ομει, Βενναιας ὁ Σομολογεννουνειν*

The variations of **Σ** and B from the original text are due here, as in the other cases, merely to copyist's blunders in the Greek.

I Chron. 12:27, A and N, *Ιωαδαε*; **Σ**, *Τωαδαε*; B, *Τωαδας*.

I Chron. 15:9, A, *Εληηλ*; **Σ**, *Ενηηλ*; B, *Ενηρ*.⁴⁵

Neh. 7:70, 72, A, *χοθωνωθ*; **Σ** and B, in both places, *μεχωνωθ*.

⁴³ Such harmless correction of Theodotion's unnecessary transliteration occurs sporadically in all of the MSS. Thus in I Chron. 2:53 B has *πόλεις Ιαειρ*, while A retains *Καριαθιαειρ*.

⁴⁴ Presumably *εν* from *ω*, as occasionally elsewhere.

⁴⁵ How it is possible for a scholar who has both commented on the books of Chronicles and edited their Hebrew text to say (as quoted above): "B hat . . . im ganzen den besseren

I Esdr. 5:66, A, *Ασβασαρεθ*, the original (corrupt) reading of the I Esdr. fragment; B, N, *Ασβακαφαθ*; and this still more corrupt form stood in the *Hexapla*, as is shown by the Syriac and Ethiopic versions.

I Esdr. 8:7, A, *Εξρας*; B, *Αψαρας* (!); so also the Syr.-Hex. and the Eth. (with a slight variation). Cf. the form found in B in 9:46.

I Esdr. 8:31. For *Φααθμωαβ* (or Π'), given in all the MSS which are not Hexaplar, B, Syriac, and Ethiopic have *Μααθμωαβ*.

I Esdr. 8:33. The Hebrew (Ezr. 8:7) has: *מִבְנֵי עִלָּם יִשְׁעִיָּה*. This was correctly rendered in the I Esdras text, as A and its associates show: *ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ελαμ, Ἰεσσίας*. In the text of Origen's LXX column, the first letter of each of the two proper names was missing; B has *ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λαμ, Ἑσias*, and with this the Ethiopic agrees, though combining the two proper names into one; Syriac has *ܠܡܠܟܐ ܥܝܠܐ*, i. e. the same text, but reading MAA in place of ΛAM.

These examples, which are truly representative, could be vastly multiplied. And they all tell the same story. It is an interesting question, but one which we hardly have the means of answering, how Origen happened to choose this inferior text for his "Septuagint." Possibly some old and venerated codex led him astray; or it may be that he made the same mistake which modern scholars have made. Not knowing that Theodotion was the author of this version—and we may be sure (see *AJSL*, p. 68) that he did not know it—he may have looked with suspicion on the Greek text that agreed closely with MT, and have preferred the one that showed somewhat more divergence. Even the latter stood nearer to the Hebrew (leaving proper names out of account) than was the case with the Greek versions of most of the Old Testament books.

3. *The Versions Made from Origen's "Septuagint"*

The main facts regarding the *Syriac* translation, made by Paul of Tellā, I have already set forth (*AJSL*, pp. 65 ff.). It is most unfortunate that just this portion of the Maes codex, which

Text, auch bei den Namen," when it is everywhere as clear as daylight that the difference between the readings of A and B, in Swete's apparatus, is a difference due simply to inner-Greek corruption, and that A has, or approximates to, the very forms from which those of B were corrupted, passes my comprehension.

contained Chronicles, First Esdras, Ezra, and Nehemiah, should have perished utterly, leaving no trace behind. In other manuscripts I Esdras has been preserved entire; and a single MS—published in *AJSL*, pp. 71–74—gives us a few extracts from Nehemiah.

We know that this version was made from the fifth column of the *Hexapla*, and that it was very exact. In the attempt to determine its relation to the existing Hexaplar MSS of the Chron.-Ezra books we are at a great disadvantage, because of the scantiness of the material. Codex **N** lacks I Esdras; and **N**, as has already been observed, either occupies an intermediate position or else yields an eclectic text, and cannot be trusted as a witness to Origen's readings. Throughout I Esdras the Syriac stands pretty close to codex B, but represents in general a text somewhat less disfigured by the blunders of scribes. The same is true in the Nehemiah extracts. Here, where we are at last able to compare **N**, the portion of the text is too small in extent to give a satisfactory basis of comparison. The Syriac agrees very noticeably with B in reproducing the clerical blunder *Χελκεια* (ܡܠܚܐ) in 1:1, and in retaining *ἐκτετιναγμένων* (ܡܬܢܥܩܝܡܝܢ) instead of *ἐκτεταγμένων*, in 4:16(10); in the former case against all other witnesses, and in the latter against all but the faithful codex 55. On the other hand, the Syriac agrees with **N** against B in the passages 8:2, *καὶ ἔως*; 8:9, *οἱ συνετίζοντες*; *ibid.*, *ἤκουσεν*; 8:10, *μερίδας*. I have not made any careful comparison, however.

The Greek of Origen's fifth column contained his selected text expanded by the insertion of translations of the *plus* of MT, these additions being marked in each case by an asterisk and a metobelus. The early Greek transcripts of this column, made by those who wished the "true Septuagint text," omitted the asterisked portions, as we have seen. Paul of Tellā translated the whole column, retaining the signs.⁴⁶ Subsequent copyists of his version generally retained the whole text, but omitted the signs. This is true of the Nehemiah extracts in our single surviving manuscript; the *plus* of the Hebrew is there, but not distinguished in any way. See for illustration 2:1, 8; 8:18.

⁴⁶ The text of I Esdras of course did not contain any of these asterisked passages.

Of an *Ethiopic* version of Origen's "LXX," only I Esdras has thus far been published. It has not heretofore been recognized as Hexaplar in its origin. Whether a similar version of any other of the Chron.-Ezra books was made, is not known. The text was edited, from five manuscripts, by Dillmann in his *Vet. Test. Aethiopici Tom. V, Libri Apocryphi*, Berlin, 1894. He himself remarks concerning this version (p. 219) that it was made at an early date, from a Greek text which it renders very faithfully, and that it has been well preserved.

Examination of this version shows that it is a valuable witness to the Hexaplar text. It must have been made with unusual care, from a comparatively trustworthy codex. The Greek which can be restored from it coincides throughout with that obtained from the Syr.-Hex., B, 55, and (frequently) N, in sharp distinction from the other and more common type of text represented by A and the army of cursives. Some striking examples of this coincidence have already been given, and a great many more could be added if it were necessary. Ethiopic versions of Old Testament books are usually of very little consequence, and it is therefore most refreshing to find one that is really useful.

It is interesting to see what indisputable evidence is furnished of the corrupt state of the manuscript which Origen selected. Thus, in 5:18, where the old "Egyptian" reading was *Βαιθασμωθ*, the stupid doublet *Βαιθασμων ζαμμωθ* is faithfully reproduced by the Ethiopic and B (Syriac is wanting here); and in 8:29, where the ordinary text had *Φινεας*, *Γερσων*· *ἀπὸ*, the monstrous reading *Φορος*, *Ταροσσοτομος* (think of pinning our faith to such transcribers as these!) is attested by B, Syriac, and Ethiopic alike. Another good illustration is found in 9:25. Here, instead of *θυρωρῶν*, "doorkeepers," Origen's text had *θυγατέρων*, "daughters"(!), and this nonsense is transmitted, as usual, by B, Ethiopic, and Paul of Tellā. That we are ultimately dealing in these cases merely with a single very corrupt manuscript is proved conclusively—as also in a hundred similar cases—by the fact that *both* the Syrian text (preserved in L) and the ordinary Egyptian text (given by the great majority of the MSS) testify only to the correct reading.

The Ethiopic will generally be found, then, to agree with codex B. In many passages it differs, however, its distance from B being, on the whole, about the same as that of the Syriac, with which, in turn, it frequently fails to coincide.

4. *The Two Main Branches of the Greek Tradition*

In the case of the Chron.-Ezr. books, the fact of a double tradition of the Greek text can be especially well observed. The one branch may be called the Syrian, inasmuch as it forms the basis of the Lucianic recension; the other I have termed Egyptian, and this designation, though probably not exact, is at least convenient.

In the I Esdras fragment, and especially in the Story of the Youths, where there is no complication from successive translations, conformation to a Semitic text, and the like, the phenomenon of the two slightly differing types of text is seen in its simplest form. A typical case is that of the proper name in 4:29, which I have elsewhere discussed (*AJSL*, p. 183). Here, the form *Baṣakov* is attested by a formidable array of witnesses, including Josephus; while the more familiar form, *Βαρταkov*, goes back to a period considerably earlier than Origen, as is shown by the fact that it is attested by *all* our Greek MSS, excepting the few which constitute the L group. Throughout the whole of I Esdras, something similar to this can be observed. There are plainly two distinct traditions of the Greek text, differing from each other slightly, on the whole, including both the spelling of the proper names and the wording of the narrative. The variation is not at all such as to suggest two translations, but consists rather in those occasional differences which inevitably arise in the course of time, through the ordinary accidents of transmission, when documents are handed down through separate lines or families of manuscripts. The one "family" includes the text adopted by Origen, and also nearly all of the extant MSS; and we may therefore regard Alexandria as its proper home, even though it was in current use far beyond the borders of Egypt. Of the text belonging to the other line of transmission we know that it formed the basis of the one which came to be regarded as authoritative in Syria, at least in

and after the fourth century A. D. (Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 80–86). It is thus presumably the text which had been handed down in Syria and Palestine from an early date. Its influence also extended far to the north and west. The MSS containing it are few (those of the L recension), but it is also embodied in the old Latin version of I Esdras. This same type of text—plainly belonging to the same tradition as that of I Esdras—is found in other parts of the Old Testament, as is well known. A. Mez, in a pamphlet⁴⁷ published in 1895, showed that the Greek text followed by Josephus in his *Antiquities*, for the part of the Old Testament which includes Joshua, Judges, and the two books of Samuel, was usually the same which underlies the L recension. I had already, in my own investigation of the text of I Esdras, conducted in that same year, made a similar comparison for this book, and reached a result somewhat resembling that of Mez. In this case, however, Josephus' text does not correspond to the nucleus of L; nor, on the other hand, does it agree throughout with any form of the "Egyptian" tradition; it seems rather to occupy an intermediate position, giving now the reading of the one, now of the other. The cases in which Josephus coincides with L, against the ordinary I Esdras text, while not many in number, are worthy of notice. Examples are: I Esdr. 1:9, cf. Jos. x, 71, the numbers of the sheep and bullocks. I Esdr. 4:29, cf. Jos. xi, 54, the name of the father of Apama, already mentioned as an example. Ezra. 4:10 (the passage now missing in our I Esdr. 2:16 [13]), cf. Jos. xi, 19, the name of the king, Šalmanassar. Inasmuch as all the Greek texts of I Esdras came from a single MS, the beginning of the two diverging lines of tradition, Egyptian and Syrian, lies not very far back, presumably a good while after the time of Josephus. It follows that the coincidence of his text with either one of the two (in cases where we cannot suspect correction or contamination) gives us the original reading of the I Esdras fragment.

From what has been said thus far, it might be supposed that the L text embodies merely the Syro-Palestinian tradition of the

⁴⁷ *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Bücher, v.–vii. der Archäol.*, Basel. See also Swete's *Introduction*, p. 379.

I Esdras Greek in the same way that the MSS of the A and B groups embody the Egyptian tradition. This is by no means true, as will be shown below. The L text is everywhere contaminated, conflated, and arbitrarily altered, even in the Story of the Three Youths; and this unfortunate redaction—the only form in which we know the text—was undertaken at a late date.

In the canonical Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., again, we can observe the same phenomenon of a Syrian text differing slightly (in its primitive form) but unmistakably from the Egyptian text. The differentiation did not begin in this case until after the middle of the second century A. D., since it is in Theodotion's version that it takes place. We should therefore expect the variation to be relatively small, and this it is in fact; but the distinction between "Syrian" text and "Egyptian" text is a real and important one, nevertheless. No better illustration is needed than that which has already been given, above, in recording occasional instances in which the Syrian tradition preserves Theodotion's characteristic transliteration—directly against the whole tendency of the L recension—while the Egyptian emends by translating. It often happens, of course, that the L MSS contain a synonym of the word which is found in all the other codices. This is in many cases not the mere result of a somewhat free transmission, however, but rather of a deliberate revision; see below. There are not a few instances, finally, of addition, subtraction, or alteration in the Egyptian text, where L has preserved the original form. A good example is furnished by I Chron. 26:16–18, where in the whole array of MSS of the A and B groups vs. 18 contains a secondary rendering⁴⁸ which was evidently unknown in Syria, as it is wanting in L. Such revision as this is rare in the Egyptian text, however, while in L it is the rule. An example of a later Egyptian alteration, whose influence has not proceeded quite so far, is II Chron. 33:14, where MT reads: ולבוא בשער הדגים

⁴⁸ Based on a slightly different Hebrew text? The *τρεῖς* suggests שלשת + שלכת; the word [ב]מסלח is apparently in another place; העולה is not translated in either version. This added rendering makes it still more certain, by the way, that in the first clause of vs. 17 the original reading was ליום, and not הליום (the ה came from the last letter of the preceding word). Our modern translators, editors, and commentators appear not to have noticed this.

לפניו בָּבֶל. Theodotion rendered this: [Μετὰ ταῦτα ὥκοδόμησεν . . .] καὶ ἐκπορευομένων τὴν πύλην τὴν ἰχθυικὴν κυκλόθεν (reading סְבִיב) εἰς τὸ οφθαλ. In this text, through the blunders of a copyist or two and the influence of the Greek in 27:3, the word ἰχθυικὴν was lost and εἰς τὸ οφθαλ became εἰς αὐτὸ οφθα (B, al. ὄπλα). A revising hand added, presumably in the margin of a MS, a new rendering of the passage: κατὰ τὴν εἰσοδὸν τὴν διὰ τῆς πύλης τῆς ἰχθυικῆς καὶ περιεκύκλωσεν (=MT) τὸ ἄδυτον.⁴⁹ This then found its way as a doublet reading into the text of an important group of codices, including A, and into the margin of B. A single one of these changes, that of ΟΦΑΛ into ΟΦΛΑ, antedates the branching-off of the Syrian tradition; in other respects L has here kept the original reading.

In general, the best MSS of the Egyptian family present a homogeneous text which has been very little revised. By comparing them among themselves, with the help of the massoretic Hebrew, we can usually find our way back to the very words of Theodotion. The aid of L can never be dispensed with, however, and in a good many cases it is our sole Greek witness to the true reading. It is sometimes the case, to be sure, that even with the testimony of both recensions before us we are at a loss to find the original. With L alone, on the other hand, we should be very badly off. Unless it is constantly controlled by the Egyptian text it is very difficult to put it to any critical use. Along both of these main lines of tradition there has been a good deal of accidental corruption of the text, the greater part of which is easy to trace. The only type of text in which this corruption has gone very far is, as has been shown, Origen's own "Septuagint." The relation of the A group to the B group is in all other respects a close one; see, for an illustration, Neh. 12:37b-38, where a long passage is wanting in ABS, though present in many cursives as well as in the L text. It formed a part of the Theodotion version, as the *θαννουρειμ* shows (cf. 3:11). That is, the codex which was the ancestor of both A and the MS which Origen took as the basis of his text had accidentally lost this passage. Among the cursives of the Egyptian family which deserve close attention,

⁴⁹ On the possibility that this was the translation of Symmachus, see below.

cod. 56 and (especially) the Aldine MS 121⁵⁰ are conspicuous for the extent to which they have preserved the original readings of the Theodotion version.

5. *The Syrian Tradition, the Lucian Recension, and our L Text*

How wide an influence the Syro-Palestinian text exerted during its early history, while it represented merely a divergent form of the Greek tradition, we do not know. We do not even know whether it was ever a relatively correct text.⁵¹ We know simply that it preserved a good many old readings which were lost or changed in the more widely current version. It presumably deteriorated gradually, like its fellows, until the time when it was made the basis of that thoroughgoing recension which has survived to the present day.

Near the end of the third century A. D., Lucian of Antioch undertook a revision of the Greek Old Testament. The few facts which are known in regard to this Syrian editor have often been rehearsed; and the reasons why our L text is commonly supposed (and doubtless rightly) to be identical with Lucian's recension are also familiar.⁵² Even the bare comparison of the citations from Theodoret, given in Holmes and Parsons, would lead one to the conclusion that L is an Antiochian text; while the fact that it represents not a growth but an arbitrary revision is patent enough.

Occasionally in descriptions, and commonly in actual use, our L text is treated as though it were identical, or nearly identical, with the text of the Syro-Palestinian tradition. Thus Swete (*Introduction*, p. 379), in dealing with the Old Testament text used by Josephus, speaks of a probability that in certain of the historical books "the Greek Bible of Palestine during the second half of the first century presented a text not very remote from that of the recension which emanated from Antioch early in the fourth." But this is by no means the true state of the case. The version as reconstructed by Lucian bears about the same relation to the one on which it was based as a thoroughly remodeled,

⁵⁰ This codex sometimes shows a close affinity with the L MSS, it is to be observed.

⁵¹ The old Latin translation of I Esdras gives us some information on this point, to be sure; see below.

⁵² See Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 80-86.

renewed, and enlarged house bears to its smaller original. In every part of the structure, a great many of the old beams, boards, stones, and other materials have been replaced by new ones, new fabric has everywhere been superadded to the old, and the fashion of the whole has been changed. The following classes of alterations characterize the Lucian recension:

1. The text has been extensively conformed to the massoretic Hebrew. (*a*) The *plus* of MT is freely inserted; not consistently—nothing is done consistently in the L recension—but as a rule. Thus I Chron. 26:16, 17; Ezr. 9:13; 10:3; Neh. 2:1, 8; 8:9; 11:23; these being merely single examples of what takes place in every chapter. (*b*) The Greek text is very frequently corrected according to the Hebrew. The original reading of the Greek is changed from singular to plural, or vice versa, in order to conform to MT. Words which appear to be out of agreement with the Hebrew are often dropped, and their places are taken by translations of MT. So, for instance, in Ezr. 9:3, 5.

2. The Greek has been very much contaminated from other Greek texts. These include: (*a*) The parallel or duplicate accounts. Thus, a great many of the original readings of the L I Esdras have been discarded, their places being filled by the readings of the canonical version. In like manner, the readings of the parallel passages in the other historical books are adopted whenever they happen to be preferred. That is, for example, the reader of the L version of Chronicles must everywhere be prepared to find that the word or phrase with which he is dealing has simply been transplanted thither from Genesis, or Samuel, or Kings. (*b*) Readings found in any part of the Old Testament may be substituted for those of Theodotion in the interest of the harmonistic tendency. (*c*) Harmonizing alterations on the basis of the immediate context, usually very mischievous, are frequently made. Thus in I Esdr. 5:5 instead of *ὁ τοῦ Ζοροβαβέλ* L offers *ὁ καὶ Ζοροβαβέλ*.

3. One constant feature of the L recension is its conflation from various sources. Side by side with Theodotion's rendering, in these books, we very often have that of some other translator, or an extract from a parallel passage. Some of these secondary

renderings are derived from the other Hexaplar versions; some are doubtless the work of Lucian himself; still others are of unknown origin. For characteristic examples see I Chron. 22:3; Ezr. 9:13; Neh. 4:10 (2), 27 (17); 6:10. Often a correction stands beside the word it was intended to correct, as in I Chron. 4:22. Occasionally a long passage is repeated in varying form, as in I Esdr. 1:9b-13, where the I Esdras and Chronicles accounts are put side by side. Not infrequently the translation of our MT is accompanied by the rendering of a manifest corruption of it, as in Neh. 2:6, 8.

It would be interesting to search for traces of the work of Aquila and Symmachus among these double renderings, whether they are found in L or in other recensions or manuscripts of these books. Sometimes, though probably not often, the identification would be possible. In Neh. 5:13 (L), Οὕτως ἐκτινάξαι ὁ θεὸς σὺν πάντα ἄνδρα ὃς οὐ στήσει σὺν τὸν λόγον τοῦτον κ.τ.λ., where the σὺν . . . σὺν, representing **סח . . . סח**, is not in the ordinary Greek, it seems certain that we have an extract from the translation of Aquila. In 13:25 (L) the verb ἐμαδάρωσα (otherwise unknown) looks like an imitation of the Hebrew **מַעֲרִיר** (not rendered here by Theodotion) on the basis of the verb *μαδίζειν*, "make bald." If this is really its origin, it is presumably a coinage of Aquila, whose fondness for such new creations is well known.⁵³

The hand of Symmachus is pretty certainly to be seen in the double rendering of **מִדִּינָה** in the Hexaplar text (**Σ**, **Β**, but not the Syr.-Hex.) of Neh. 1:3, ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐν τῇ πόλει. We know that Symmachus would have been likely to substitute *πόλις* for the older rendering *χώρα*, for he makes this very same correction in I Kings 20:14 and Dan. 8:2. The secondary translation in II Chron. 33:14 (the passage already discussed above), where **הַעֲשֵׂה** is rendered by τὸ ἄδυτον—the doublet this time also occurring not in L but in certain Egyptian MSS—suggests Symmachus, though I do not know that it is possible to say more

⁵³ On the basis of this verb-form in Neh. 13:25, Klostermann (*Realencycl.*, loc. cit.) would emend the impossible "ἐπαλλόμεν" in Ezr. 9:3, 5 to ἐμαδαρώμεν! On the contrary, the Hebrew word which corresponds there is **מַעֲרִיר**, "my outer garment," and we must read in both verses τὸ πάλλιόν μου.

than this. In I Sam. 5:9 Symmachus renders עֲפָלִים by *κρυπτά*, and he is the only one of the translators to interpret the root עֲפָל in this way. In Neh. 3:15, where MT has הִלְשָׁה, and the ordinary Egyptian text reads τῶν κωδίων,⁵⁴ codex N has, instead, θε τοῦ Σιλωαμ. This certainly appears to be an ascription to Theodotion, as Klostermann has observed. Whether it is a correct ascription or not is another question, but the possibility can hardly be denied. In that case we should have to suppose that a rendering corresponding to our MT has supplanted the original one here.

4. Alterations merely in the interest of literary quality and completeness, or to suit the editor's dogmatic or other preferences, are everywhere abundant. These include: (a) The removal (usual, but not invariable) of Theodotion's transliterations, which are accordingly replaced by translations. For examples, see the list above. (b) The free revision of difficult phrases, often to the extent of changing their meaning and completely obscuring their relation to the original Semitic. A characteristic example is I Esdr. 4:39, where instead of the exactly rendered, but disturbing, Aramaic idiom, τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἀδίκων, "she executes judgment on all the wicked," the L text has δίκαια ποιεῖ, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἀδίκων ἀπέχεται. So in 5:6 L alters τοῦ πρώτου μηνός (for τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ μηνός) into τῷ πρώτῳ μηνί. Or in 2:17 (14) where the ordinary text has ναὸν ὑποβάλλονται—in MT יְהִי יְהִי אֵשׁ—L has "improved" the reading to ναὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα θεμελιούσιν. Or in II Chron. 2:12 (13), τὸν παῖδά μου substituted for τὸν πατέρα μου. (c) Supplementary and interpretative additions, composed freely *ad hoc*. These are also very numerous, and every one of them is a trap for the unwary text-critic who wishes to advance science by giving new Hebrew readings from "Lucian." For example, in II Chron. 18:19 the narrative runs as follows: 'Yahwè said to his heavenly retainers, Who will mislead Ahab? One proposed one thing, and another another.' At this point L adds: καὶ εἶπεν, Οὕτως οὐ δυνήσει;⁵⁵

⁵⁴ This word is a veritable translation of הִלְשָׁה (cf. the Aramaic אֲלִישָׁה, "hide"), and is by no means to be altered into βολίδων, as Klostermann proposes on the basis of the rendering in 4:17 (11).

⁵⁵ Lagarde edits—wrongly, as I believe—καὶ εἶπεν οὕτως Οὐ δυνήσει.

"But Yahwè said, You will not succeed in this way." Compare vs. 21. In Neh. 4:8b (vs. 18 in the L Greek) just after the word **בְּפִי־הֶם**, L has *καὶ ὥρκισα αὐτοὺς κύριον λέγων*, a purely arbitrary insertion in the Greek. There are many such examples, besides a good many cases in which the addition of a word or two has been made with interpretative intent. Thus, the words "to Jerusalem," Neh. 8:1; "of Benjamin," 11:8; the name "Ezra" in 8:18; see also I Esdr. 4:13, 48, 61; 5:5; Neh. 12:1, etc. Such interjected vocatives as "O king!" I Esdr. 4:43; "O Lord!" 4:60, are of course to be expected. And finally, a characteristic example is afforded by the close of I Esdras. In the original fragment, the end was reached in the middle of a sentence; but in the L text this inelegant conclusion is improved by the addition of a verse (Neh. 8:13) from the canonical version. (d) The substitution of synonyms. This well-known and comparatively harmless peculiarity of the L recension needs no illustration.

So much for the deliberate alterations undertaken by the Lucianic revision. As for the accidental corruption which the Syro-Palestinian Greek text had already undergone in the process of its transmission, before suffering this very extensive editorial transformation, it is sufficient to say that it does not appear to have been different, in kind or degree, from that which befell the standard Egyptian text. In general, the amount of this accidental corruption is much underestimated by those who have made use of Lagarde's edition.⁵⁶ Klostermann (*loc. cit.*, p. 508) even finds in some of it the evidence of differing dialects: "Wenigstens ist es kein Zufall, wenn die dentale Tenuis durch Sibilans ersetzt wird, wie *ατιτα* (**אֲטִיטָא**), *ατηρ*, *τελμων*, bei Luc, durch *αζιζα*, *αζηρ*, *σελμων*." But this is a mistake. These are scribal blunders

⁵⁶It is true, in general, of the modern use of the Greek Bible for text-critical purposes that recourse is had far too often to the hypothesis of divergent Hebrew texts, while there is far too little appreciation of the extent to which the Greek texts themselves have been corrupted in transmission. It is generally taken for granted, moreover (see, e. g., Benzinger's remark on the Greek MSS of Kings, in the introduction to his *Comm.*) that the text which diverges most from MT is the oldest and most important. But this is a criterion which has no value unless it is supplemented by exact information as to the quality of individual MSS and the nature of translations and recensions. Codex B and the L text, for instance, usually show the greatest divergence from MT, and in both cases the divergence means, as a rule, merely perversion of the older readings, which (more nearly agreeing with MT) are found in other MSS.

of a very common order, which abound also in the MSS of the ordinary text, and especially (of course) in B and its fellows.

These facts make it plain that the Greek published by Lagarde is not at all "the old Greek Bible of Palestine," and often bears little resemblance to it. It is in part a mixed text which is the result of an eclectic process, and in part a text arbitrarily constructed *de novo*; besides all the accidental deterioration which it has suffered. The fact cannot be emphasized too strongly that L in Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., when it differs from the ordinary Greek, *usually does not represent another Hebrew text*. It is mainly, of course, a translation of the Hebrew which lay before Theodotion. But this Heb. text almost everywhere agreed with our MT; moreover, the translation is very well preserved in the Egyptian MSS, and it is only rarely that L can improve upon their readings. It would presumably almost never be the case that a correct reading preserved only in L would happen also to represent a divergence in Theodotion's Hebrew. The doublet readings in L, whether Hexaplaric or not, are, as a rule, derived either from our MT or from a manifestly corrupt form of it. Really helpful corrections of MT are extremely rare. One is to be found in Neh. 11:17, τοῦ αἵνου for הַחֵלֶה; undoubtedly derived from another Hebrew text, since Jerome's Latin makes the same correction. But in the most of the cases where L presents variant readings which sound plausible, we are not by any means at liberty to suppose that these were derived from a Hebrew text; on the contrary, they are pretty certain to be arbitrary improvements, of one kind or another, in the Greek itself. It follows, that emendation of MT on the basis of L alone is almost never permissible in these books; never, in fact, except for the strongest reasons.

All this is obvious enough; and yet our Old Testament scholars, in using the L text of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., treat it habitually as though it represented a Hebrew text of its own. Thus Kittel,⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Kittel, in his *Biblia Hebraica*, recently published, constantly includes in his notes at the foot of the page Hebrew readings given on the sole authority of L. If these "variant readings" are to have any significance at all in his apparatus, they must be supposed actually to have stood in a Hebrew text and to have been rendered by this Greek. But of the great majority of them this is not true. They are mere excrescences on the Greek, due either to the irresponsible reviser or else to obvious errors of Greek transcribers. Nothing corresponding to them ever stood in any Hebrew text of the Chronicler's work. I

in his several works on Chron.; Benzinger,⁵⁸ in his commentary on Chronicles; Bertholet, *Comm.* on Ezr.-Neh., and others. Siegfried, *Comm.* on Ezr.-Neh., does not pay much attention to the examination of the text.

Allied to the Lagarde text, but plainly not belonging to it, is the old Latin translation of I Esdras. This was made from the Syro-Palestinian Greek some time before the Lucianic revision; presumably in the second century A. D., since it is cited by Cyprian. In this version we really have a representative of the old Syro-Palestinian text, and the aid which it gives is important. The many additions, corrections, and conflations introduced by Lucian do not appear in it.⁵⁹ Its text has come down to us in several slightly differing forms, which need to be re-examined.

The L Greek text, then, is an instrument only to be used with the utmost caution. It is true that even in Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. it contains a good deal of valuable material, not found elsewhere; but this is much less in amount, and far more difficult to secure, than is commonly supposed. The quest of it is not quite the search for two grains of wheat in two bushels of chaff, for in this case the material in which it is imbedded has also a certain value of its own—but only when its origin and true character are under-

have observed one case, Neh. 11:8, in which MT can be emended in accordance with a reading peculiar to L; but even here it may be that the *οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ* came from a happy conjecture and not from any real Hebrew reading. For examples of this mistaken use, see his notes on I Chron. 4:41 (where the Greek must originally have been *τὰς πηγὰς ἃς εὗρον ἐκεῖ*), and its Heb. = exactly our MT), 5:20 (of course either *ἐβον[θη]σαν* or *ἐβον[θήθη]σαν*), 9:37; 12:24; 13:1 (two places); 16:30 (the second half-verse transferred bodily from the Greek of Ps. 96:10!); 21:20 (see below); 24:24 (contamination from 23:20); II Chron. 7:20; 9:29 (!); 18:2, 29 (both of these conformed to the parallels in Kings); 22:6; 25:1; 27:4; 33:2; Ezra 4:23; 10:3, 24; Neh. 9:6, 32 (!); 13:1, 9.

In general, the apparatus of this *Biblia Hebraica* in Chron.-Ezr.-Neh. consists largely of information which is quite worthless for its intended purpose. The "LXX" notes have rarely any significance for the Hebrew text. In the L version of I Chron. 9:31, for instance, we have a bit of corrupt Greek side by side with its correct original. Why include such stuff here? Or why print in II Chron. 2:13 "LXX + καὶ ὑψάινειν," when it is obvious at the first glance that the verb had its origin in a blundering dittography of the first letters of the following Hebrew word? Plain blunders of Greek copyists are also recorded, as in I Chron. 7:8 (twice). The apparatus of a Hebrew Bible (and a reprint of MT at that!) is not the place to study the performances of third-rate Greek scribes, interesting as the study might be under other circumstances.

⁵⁸ See, for example, his comments on I Chron. 2:18 f.; 3:22; 11:1, 8 (*περιεβίωσα τὸ εἶ*, cf. Ex. 22:18), 11 (contamination from II Sam. 23:8), 22; 15:13 (!); II Chron. 2:12; 35:3.

⁵⁹ Such as those in 1:9-12; 2:17 (18); 4:13, 39, 43, 48, 60, 61; 5:5—to give only the examples which have already been mentioned. The incomplete sentence at the end of the I Esdras fragment is filled out in the Latin, but not in the same way as in the Lucian Greek.

stood. The folly of "criticizing" our MT by the use of a Greek text which has itself not been criticized at all is nowhere more striking than in the present-day use of Lagarde's edition. The rule usually adopted appears to be: Take any Greek reading which seems useful, no matter whence it comes. Thus it happens that words due simply to copyists' blunders in the Greek, others which plainly resulted from a corrupt form of our MT, and readings which a closer scrutiny would have shown to be merely later doublet renderings of the same text, are all laid under contribution, and new and strange Hebrew phrases, said to correspond to them, are forthwith constructed.⁶⁰ Since the conglomerate L text offers so much that is not found elsewhere, it is naturally a mine for those who are not over particular. Klostermann, in the introduction to his commentary on the books of Samuel, quoted in Driver, *Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. lii, has expressed himself as follows: "Let him who would advance science accustom himself above all things to the use of Lagarde's edition of the recension of Lucian." Theoretically, this has some justification—though it would be better to advise students to begin by learning to make a scientific use of the ordinary Greek text; in practice, there has thus far been little use made of the L

⁶⁰ To give a few characteristic examples: In I Chron. 21:20 the Chronicler wrote מַתְחַבְּאִים, as is attested both by MT and by Theodotion's transliteration (see above). The Hebrew word presents no difficulty whatever in its context. Theodotion's transliteration was replaced (as usual) in some MSS by the translation κρυβόμενοι. In L this was corrupted (possibly under the influence of the Greek of II Sam. 24:20, διαπορευομένους, = עֲבָרִים, though the word there stands in an altogether different clause, and refers to other persons) to πορευόμενοι. On the basis of this reading Klostermann emends to מַתְחַבְּאִים (! not an equivalent of πορευόμενοι, nor graphically similar to MT, nor at all suited to this context), which is approved by Kittel, *Polychrome Bible and Comm.* In Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* There is a note: "Read with L and II Sam. עֲבָרִים," a specimen of textual criticism which could hardly be surpassed.

One of the first emendations made by Guthe, in his *Polychrome Ezra and Nehemiah*, is an insertion in the text of Ezr. 1:3, on the sole basis of a reading in the Lucian I Esdras. But no one who is well acquainted with the L recension could doubt for a moment that its οὗ προθυμεῖται τοῦ πορευθῆναι (2:3) is a free editorial insertion in the Greek.

In Neh. 4:17, where the Hebrew reads אִישׁ שְׁלָחַר הַמִּים (a corruption of בִּרְךְ, cf. II Chron. 23:10), the L Greek has a characteristic double translation καὶ ἄνδρα ὃν ἀπέστειλλον ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, ἀνὴρ καὶ ὅπλον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ. Guthe actually turns this two-fold nonsense into Hebrew, inserting also an אֲשֶׁר and the two prepositions עַל and אֶל, and substitutes it for MT! Kittel also prints this newly made Hebrew in his critical apparatus, and Bertholet (*Comm.*) mentions it with respect.

These are merely typical instances, of three different kinds, one from each of the three books. The list could be extended to include nearly all of the modern "critical" use of L in Chron.-Ezr.-Neh.

text in any part of the Old Testament which has tended noticeably to advance science. Not one in twenty of all the "emendations" of the Hebrew text hitherto made on the basis of Lucian readings will survive any critical examination. And the opportunities of doing harm through uncritical methods are much more numerous here than elsewhere. I would suggest instead this maxim: Let him who would advance science keep away as far as possible from critical operations with the Lucian recension until he has learned what it is and how to use it.

There is one purpose, however, for which the attention of scholars really needs to be directed to the L text at once, and that is, for the study of the Greek itself. There is doubtless much to be learned from it as to the history of both Hebrew original and the Greek versions, especially the Hexaplar, as well as in regard to the primitive readings of the Syro-Palestinian recension. And one of the first important undertakings of the criticism of the Greek Old Testament should be the reconstruction, so far as it is possible, of Theodotion's translation of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh.

V. THE CRITICAL PROCESS IN RESTORING THE SEMITIC TEXT

In investigating the Hebrew-Aramaic text of these books, in the part of the history covered by I Esdras, the process (after making sure of the traditional reading) must always be the following.

1. Ascertain the Egyptian Greek text of *the canonical recension*. Swete's edition usually (though not always) suffices for this purpose; and when it is used, the reading of codex A must always be given the presumption of superiority over that of codices B and S.

2. Compare the Syrian text (Lagarde's edition) of the same book, bearing in mind its treacherous character. By the comparison we can reach approximately the original reading of Theodotion's version.

3. By comparing (a) the reading thus gained with (b) the Latin version of Jerome, and then with (c) the massoretic text, we can approximate to—and in most cases reach with certainty—

the Heb.-Aram. text which was selected, edited,⁶¹ and made normative by the Jewish scholars at the beginning of the second century A. D.

4. Ascertain the reading of the Egyptian Greek text of *I Esdras*, using for this purpose (*a*) the text of A and the allied cursives, with which must be compared the witnesses to the Hexaplar Greek, including (*b*) codex B, (*c*) the Syriac of Paul of Tellā, and (*d*) the Ethiopic version.

5. Compare the Syro-Palestinian I Esdras, using (*a*) Lagarde's Greek (with the greatest caution, since this particular recension has not only suffered the usual "Lucianic" alterations, but has also been very extensively contaminated from the canonical Ezra), (*b*) the old Latin version, and (*c*) the text preserved by Josephus in his *Antiquities*. By thus comparing the Syrian with the Egyptian readings of I Esdras it is usually possible to gain the true text of the old Greek translation of Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., which was probably made shortly before the middle of the second century B. C.

6. Regain the Heb.-Aram. text from which this translation was made; and attempt, through comparison of this with the text of the second century A. D., to restore the words originally written by the Chronicler, or found by him in the sources which he used. In reasoning from the old Greek version to the Semitic text which lay behind it, one must bear in mind that this translation, while truly a "close" one, is considerably more free than the later renderings; also, that the Greek text has been much longer exposed to accidental corruption than that of Theodotion's version. Many readings which seem to point to variation in the Semitic original are really due to changes which have taken place in the Greek itself. And finally, in comparing the two parent Semitic texts with each other, some account must be taken of their relative correctness, so far as any general estimate is possible.

⁶¹ See *AJSL*, p. 139, also above, p. 83.

CRITICAL NOTES ON ESTHER

PAUL HAUPT

CRITICAL NOTES ON ESTHER

PAUL HAUPT

In the following nn. I have not attempted to give all the divergences exhibited by the Ancient Versions; as a rule, I have recorded only variations which throw some light on the Heb. text.* The ancient versions of E are so free and inaccurate (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **3**, 13. 14; **4**, 1. 11. 14; **5**, 13; **6**, 1; **7**, 3. 4) that it would be a waste of time to discuss all discrepancies. It does not help us very much for the understanding of the Heb. text if we are informed half a dozen times (**4**, 7; **8**, 1. 7. 13; **9**, 15. 18) that the K^ethiv is יהודיים, but that the Q^erê prefers the contracted form יהודים; or that ℣^v adds after ויהי: μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους = אחר הדברים האלה (as in **2**, 1) but that it omits ἕως Αἰθιοπίας = ועד כוש, while it adds in **3**, 12: ἀπὸ Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας, ταῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ χόραις; that it reads τοῖς φίλοις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ τοῖς Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων ἐνδόξοις for לכל שריו ועבדיו חיל פרס ומדי הפרתמים; that it renders ואת יקר תפארת גדולתו: καὶ τὴν δόξαν τῆς εὐφροσύνης τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ, &c. &c.

W's† and J's‡ theory that ℣ is more original than ℞ seems to me untenable (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **6**, 1; **7**, 4; **8**, 8). The fact that the text of ℣ does not read like a translation from the Heb. (*cf.* however πεσὼν πεσῆ, **6**, 13)|| is easily explained by the popularity of E. As soon as a foreign book becomes popular, the translations become more idiomatic and free.§ If a French play is to be a success in America or England, it is impossible to present a

*It might be well to add that I completed the restoration of the Heb. text of E on Oct. 16, 1905, and that I revised it twice, on Aug. 6, 1906, and July 11, 1907. The Critical Notes were begun on Jan. 24, 1906, and finished on the following day; they were rewritten from June 9 to July 13 and on Aug. 4 and 5, 1906. Finally I recast them again from June 4 to July 12, 1907.

†Hugo Willrich, *Judaica* (Göttingen, 1900) p. 15; *cf.* also p. 27, l. 20. Contrast *Pur.* 28, 15.

‡G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ester* (Leyden, 1901) p. vi.

|| *Cf.* my remarks in *Daniel* 16, 23.

§Note the adaptations of the proper names in ℣ℤ, discussed in nn. on **1**, 10. 14 and **9**, 7.

literal translation. It is necessary to introduce additions as well as omissions. I see nothing in \mathfrak{G} that is incompatible with the view that \mathfrak{G} is based on \mathfrak{H} or, to be more accurate, on a recension of the Heb. text from which \mathfrak{H} is derived (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **1**, 10. 14; **7**, 4; **9**, 9). W deems it not impossible that E was intended for Alexandria, and therefore written in Greek; afterwards, he thinks, it may have been translated into Heb. for the use of the Palestinian Jews. But E was written by a Persian Jew about 130 B. C. The Alexandrian festal legend for the Feast of Purim is the so-called Third Book of the Maccabees, and the Book of Judith is a Palestinian Purim legend; see Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 7, ll. 30–38. I cite this book as *Pur*. The first number after *Pur*. refers to the page; the second, to the line. *Cant.* denotes Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from AJSL **18**, 193–245; **19**, 1–32. In the same way *Eecl.* is used for Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) and *Nah.* for Haupt, *The Book of Nahum* (Baltimore, 1907) reprinted from JBL **26**, 1–53.

The unabbreviated names of Biblical Books printed in *Italics* (*e. g.* *Kings*, *Psalms*, &c) denote the critical notes on the Heb. text in SBOT, *i. e.* my edition of *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*; the first number after the name of the Book refers to the page in SBOT, the second indicates the line. Thus *Genesis* 50, 9 refers to p. 50, l. 9 of the critical edition of the Book of Genesis in SBOT; but Gen. **50**, 9 means chapter 50, verse 9 of the Book of Genesis. In the references to SBOT the (unabbreviated) names of the Books are printed in *Italics*; in the references to the received text of the Heb. Bible the names of the books are abbreviated, but not *italicized*, and the numbers of the chapters are printed in heavy-faced figures (**1**, **2**, **3**, &c).

I use \mathfrak{G}^V for \mathfrak{G}^V , *i. e.* $\text{E}\sigma\theta\eta\rho\beta$ in L's edition (= A in Fritzsche's edition) and \mathfrak{G}^L for $\text{E}\sigma\theta\eta\rho\alpha$ (= B in Fritzsche's edition). \mathfrak{T} denotes the first Targum in L's edition; $\mathfrak{T}^2 = \text{חֲרִיגֹם שֵׁנִי}$ (the numbers after \mathfrak{T}^2 refer to the pages and lines of L's edition). The apocryphal additions to E in \mathfrak{G} are cited according to the cc. and vv. of the Vulgate (\mathfrak{J}) *e. g.* **11**, 2 = \mathfrak{G}^V **1**, 1. This corresponds to the numeration in the Authorized Version (AV).

In addition to these symbols note the following abbreviations:

AG²=Delitzsch, *Assyr. Grammatik* (Berlin, 1906).—AJP=*American Journal of Philology*.—AJSL=*American Journal of Semitic Languages*.—AoF=Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*.—AOG=Winckler, *Der alte Orient und die Geschichtsforschung* (Berlin, 1906)=MVAG 11, 1.—ASKT=Haupt, *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte* (Leipzig, 1881).—AT=*Altes Testament*.—AV=Authorized Version.—AV^m=Authorized Version, margin.—B=Bertheau, *Die Bücher Esra, Nechemia und Ester*, second edition (Leipzig, 1887) by Victor Ryssel.—BA=*Beiträge zur Assyriologie* von Delitzsch und Haupt.—BAL=Haupt, *Beiträge zur assyrischen Lautlehre*=*Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, April 25, 1883.—BDB=Francis Brown (assisted by S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs) *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Boston, 1906).—BL=Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907).—BT=L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*.—C=Paulus Cassel, *Das Buch Esther* (Berlin, 1878).—c.=chapter; cc.=chapters.—Cant.=Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from AJSL 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32.—Ch=Cheyne.—CV (i. e. *Congress-Vortrag*)=Haupt, *Die akkadische Sprache* (Berlin, 1883).—DB=Dictionary of the Bible.—E=Esther.—EB=*Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by Cheyne and Black.—Eccl.=Haupt, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) reprinted from AJP, No. 102.—G=Greek Bible (LXX).—G^A=*Alexandrinus*.—G^L=Lucianic recension edited by L (Göttingen, 1883).—G^S=*Sinaiticus*.—G^V=*Vaticanus*.—GB¹⁴=Gesenius' *Hebr. Handwörterbuch*, edited by Buhl, fourteenth edition (Leipzig, 1905).—GK²⁷=Gesenius' *Hebr. Grammatik*, edited by K (Leipzig, 1902)—English translation of GK³⁶ by Collins and Cowley (Oxford, 1898).—H=Haman.—HW=Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896).—IN=Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle, 1906).—J=G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ester* (Leyden, 1901).—J (i. e. Jerome)=Vulgate.—JAOS=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*.—JBL=*Journal of Biblical Literature*.—JHUC=*Johns Hopkins University Circulars* (Baltimore).—K=Kautzsch (especially his *Textbibel*).—1 K, 2 K=The first (second) Book of the Kings.—KAT³=Eb. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das AT*, third edition, edited by Zimmern und Winckler (Berlin, 1903).—KB=Eb. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*.—L=Lagarde.—l.=line; ll.=lines.—LB=Luther's Bible.—LOT=S. R. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the OT*.—M=Mordecai.—1 M, 2 M=

*It might be well to add that the references to C were inserted after I had completed the revision of my manuscript, in July, 1907. Some etymologies proposed by C are impossible, but several of his remarks are superior to the observations found in the leading commentaries.

The first (second) Book of the Maccabees.— \mathfrak{M} = Masoretic Text.—MDOG = *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (Berlin).—MSS = Manuscripts.—MVAG = *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (Berlin).—N = Nöldeke.—n. = note; nn. = notes.—Nah. = Haupt, *The Book of Nahum* (1907) = JBL **26**, 1-53.—NT = New Testament.—O = Oort, *Emendationes* (see *Proverbs* 69, 4).—OLZ = *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, edited by Peiser.—OT = Old Testament.—p. = page; pp. = pages.—Pur. = Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) = BA **6**, part 2.—R = Ryssel (especially his edition of B and his critical nn. in the *Beilagen* to K's *Die Heilige Schrift des AT*).—S = Siegfried, *Esra, Nehemia und Esther* (Göttingen, 1901).—1 S, 2 S = The first (second) Book of Samuel.— \mathfrak{S} = Syriac Version (*Peshita*).— \mathfrak{S}^A = *Ambrosianus*.—SBOT = Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the OT*.—SD = Haupt, *Über einen Dialekt der sumerischen Sprache* = *Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Nov. 3, 1880.—SFG = Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (Leipzig, 1879).—SG² = Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, second edition (Leipzig, 1898).— \mathfrak{T} = Targum.— \mathfrak{T}^2 = תרגום שני.—TBAI = Cheyne, *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* (London, 1907).—THCO (i. e. Transactions of the Hamburg Congress of Orientalists) = *Verhandlungen des xiii. Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses zu Hamburg*, 1902 (Leyden, 1904).—v. = verse; vv. = verses.—VG = Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1907).—W = Willrich, *Judaica* (Göttingen, 1900).—Wd = Wildeboer's commentary on E in *Die fünf Megillot* (1898) = part xvii of K. Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT*.—WdG = *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, by W. Wright, third edition revised by M. J. de Goeje (Cambridge, 1896).—Wn = Winckler (especially his paper on E in AoF **3**, 1-64, Leipzig, 1901, whole number xvi).—ZA = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.—ZAT = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.—ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.—ZK = *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*.

A scholar who considers the Moabite stone to be metrical may discuss the poetic form of E;* but so far as I can see, it is written in prose, just as Ruth and Jonah are (apart from the Maccabean psalm inserted in c. **2**; see AJSL **23**, 256).

For אִשְׁתָּר = Ištar, a feminine form of Ašur, *Benignus*, so that E = *Benigna* (cf. Lat. *Bona Dea*) see my paper *The Name*

† Cf. the remarks of Cornill and Ed. Meyer cited in AJSL **23**, 221; also Budde, *Geschichte der althebr. Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 33.

Istar in JAOS 28, 112–119; and for the Herodotean prototype of E and Sheherazade (*Φαιδρυμένη*, Her. 3, 68) see *Pur.* 8, 21 (cf. 40, 20). \mathfrak{T} (241, 16) says of E: כוכב נוגהא איתקרי שמה אסתר בשם כוכב נוגהא יונית אסתירא.

א

(1) \mathfrak{A} אַחְשִׁיָרֶשׁ is a corruption of אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ = Old Pers. Khšayārša. It is not necessary to suppose that אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ (اخشوارش) became אַחְשִׁיָרֶשׁ (*Kings* 126, 47; 270, 22) and that the ו and ר were afterwards transposed, while the י was corrupted to ך. The name אַחְשִׁיָרֶשׁ does not appear as אַחְשִׁיָרֶשׁ.

For the transposition of the vowels cf. אַחְשִׁירֶפֶנים (3, 12) for אַחְשִׁירֶפֶנים = Old Pers. *khšatrapāvan*, also מִרְדָּךְ for מִרְדָּךְ (see n. on מִרְדָּךְ, 2, 5) and מִרְדָּשֶׁן for מִרְדָּשֶׁן, אַרְחֶשְׁמֶן, Assy. Araxšāmna; see *Pur.* 23, 15; * cf. L, *Purim*, p. 52, below.

The first ך of אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ is a corruption of י, the second ו is due to dittography of the ו; cf. the dittographed ו in בטרום and תעבורי, Ruth 2, 8; 3, 14; also לעבוריך Nah. 2, 1 (see *Nah.* 29, below) and פרוים = פרוים (9, 19). The letters ו and י as well as ך and ר are often confounded, dittographed and haplographed (*Pur.* 51, 22). For ך and י cf. E 8, 13; Ruth 2, 1, and *Kings* 259, 29. \mathfrak{S} reads correctly אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ, just as we find in an Aramaic inscription: אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ, corresponding to the Babyl. Xiši'aršu (-i, -a) or Axšīaršu (x = ח).

For confusion of ו and ר (ד) cf. my remarks on רמה בים סוס ורכב instead of סוס ורכב and רואנ'הו † for ואנ'הו (Ex. 15, 2) in AJSL 20, 158, below (see also 23, 225, below). The suffix in סוס ורכב ‡ is due to dittography of the initial ו of the following רמה. In the gloss 2 K 16, 10 we find דומשק for דומשק; in Job 41, 21 (a variant to v. 20) תותה stands for תרתה = Assy. tartaxu, shaft, arrow (KB 6, 328). In E 1, 16; 2, 21; 3, 12; 8, 10 we find אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ; in 10, 1: אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ. The form אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ (اخشوارش) is more correct than אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ, although the first ו is a corruption of י. In אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ the omission of the ו (for י) before ר is due to haplography; similarly ר has been omitted before ו in חפרו (for חפרו) E 7, 8, and \mathfrak{S} (δαμάλεις, حدمال).

* Cf. also מַבּוּל = Assy. a b ū b u (*Nah.* 31) and modern Arab. qaba-jūr for French *abat-jour* (VG 1, 121, below).

† For נאד = נאד to praise cf. Eth. ስዕል (AG², §146).

‡ IN 23 Ed. Meyer still renders: *Ross und Reiter*; he also maintains the pre-Exilic date of Moses' Song of Triumph. He agrees with me, however, in stating (p. 49, below) that there is some historical nucleus in the story of the catastrophe of the Egyptians; cf. my remarks in AJSL 20, 149. 153. 154. 158.

read פרוּת instead of פְּרוּת, Joel 1, 17; פּוּרִים must be derived from פּוּרִי = פּוּרִי; see n. on 9, 26.

In 27 out of the 29 cases in which the name אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ occurs in E it is due to scribal expansion; cf. especially 1, 15, 16; it is original only in the opening clause 'וַיְהִי בִימֵי א' (1, 1) and in the phrase מַלְכוּת א' (3, 6;—9, 30 is a gloss). Wherever we find הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד or הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה (GK²⁷, § 131, g) either the name or the title is due to scribal expansion. The proper Eng. phrase is *King David*, the proper Heb. expression is דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ. *The king David* is neither good Eng. nor good Heb. The proper names (David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Jehoram, Jehoash, Rezin, Josiah) must be omitted *e. g.* in 1 K 1, 32, 37; 5, 27; 8, 5; 9, 11; 12, 6, 18; 2 K 3, 6; 14, 11; 16, 6, 11, 17; 22, 24; 23, 29,* while the omission of the title *king* is required *e. g.* in 1 K 1, 53; 2, 29; 10, 16, 21, 23; 2 K 16, 11, 16; 25, 8. Even in cases where הַמֶּלֶךְ is affixed to the proper name, the title may often be omitted; cf. *e. g.* 2 K 9, 15 and Stade's nn. (in *Kings*) on the passages cited above.

It is often stated that the name of God is never mentioned in E (cf. n. on 4, 14) while the King of Persia is referred to 187 times, and his kingdom 26† times; cf. *e. g.* W 27 and Hastings' DB 1, 733, footnote. S (137, n. 1) remarks that the King is mentioned 190 times. I find that the name אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ occurs 29 times, while he is simply referred to as the King 193 times. This would be 222 times, not 187. In several passages, however, the title הַמֶּלֶךְ does not refer to Xerxes in particular, but means *royal* in general.

Ⓔ has for אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ the name of his son Ἀртаξέσης (cf. *Ezra* 32, 5). This discrepancy is not striking if the name אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ is a later addition in all the passages except 1, 1 and 3, 6 (see above). Ⓔ Ἀσσηνός is a later correction, just as Ⓔ Οὐαστιν for Ⓔ Ἀστιν. S reads, at the beginning of the parenthesis, אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ. According to AoF 3, 5 אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ is Cambyses, and the conspiracy in 2, 21 was aimed at Cyrus (cf. below, *ad* 2, 21) but King אֲחֵשֶׁרֶשׁ in E represents Alexander Balas (see *Pur.* 29, 8; 35, 42) i. e. the *poor and wise youth* alluded to in Eccl. 4, 13 (for *poor*=humble, of mean birth, of low origin, see *AJSL* 23, 226, n. 13).

The parentheses are a characteristic feature of E (cf. *Pur.* 9, 6). We find a great many explanatory parentheses in Herodotus; cf. *e. g.* Holder's edition where the parentheses are enclosed in () while glosses are enclosed in []. As E was written about b.c. 130, the Sadducean author may have read Herodotus' work, just as the Sadducean author of Ecclesiastes may have been acquainted with the works of Epicurus

*This must not be interpreted to mean that all proper names, or titles, that might be dispensed with should be canceled, even if they are omitted in some of the Ancient Versions.

†This is correct only if we include מַלְכוּת in 1, 19; 4, 14; 5, 1, where it refers to E.

and other Greek philosophers (*Eccl.* 6, n. 7). I have indicated the parentheses by () *e.g.* vv. 13. 14; 2, 5. 12; 5, 7. Transpositions are indicated by { } and [] *e.g.* v. 6, not by ().

For הָדֵד we would expect הָדֵד or הָדֵד (*cf.* אֶסְתֵּר for אֶסְתֵּר, הָרָאָה for הָרָאָה, &c) corresponding to Syr. ܗܕܕ, Arab. هند Hind. 𐤇 has הִינְדִיאַ, but 𐤇 ܗܕܕ ܠܚܡܐ. In l. 14 of the inscription of Darius at Naqs-i-Rustam the name appears as Indū. The accent of הָדֵד should be on the ultima, not on the penult (הָדֵד, הָדֵד, הָדֵד, not הָדֵד). B thought that the pointing הָדֵד might have been influenced by הָדֵד וְהָדֵד, but these two words are not the only *segholate* (see *Proverbs* 67, 19) forms לִי; *cf.* שָׁדֵד, &c. The o in הָדֵד instead of i or e may be explained in the same way as in נָא = Assy. Ni', *Thebes*; see *Nah.* 30 and *cf.* my *Assyr. E-vowel*, p. 22. It is possible that the Heb. o was pronounced ō, just as the Assy. u seems to have been sounded as ū; see *Ezekiel* 64, 43.

(2) The prefixed בִּימִים הָהֵם is due to scribal expansion.

According to AOG 21 כִּשְׁבַת הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ means, not *when the King sat on his royal throne*, but *when he acceded to the throne*. The beginning of the following verse, however, shows that the great banquet was given, not at the accession of the King, but in the third year of his reign. W (16, above; *cf.* 21, below) referred 𐤇 ἐθρονίσθη (several MSS have ἐνεθρονίσθη) to the solemn enthronization of the King, which may have been celebrated three years after the accession of the King (*cf.* Jacob, *ZAT* 10, 281). The German Emperor William I. succeeded his elder brother Frederick William IV. on Jan. 2, 1861, but his coronation was celebrated at Königsberg on Oct. 18, 1861. 𐤇 ἐθρονίσθη (which is a free translation of כִּשְׁבַת הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ) may refer to the enthronization (*cf.* ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς ἡμέραις) but this is not the original meaning of 𐤇. *Cf.* also E 5, 1 and Herod. 7, 102; Plut. *Themist.* c. 13.

Heb. בִּירָה (𐤁 𐤁ִירָה, 𐤁 𐤁ִירָה) is a Babyl. loanword = būrtu, *citadel* (HW 185^a). 𐤇 שׁוּשַׁן הַבִּירָה denotes the Acropolis of Susa; so, correctly S. *Cf.* my remarks on the Acropolis of Nineveh (*Nah.* 44). The royal palace was situated in the Acropolis (C 13, below) not in the city. The city was separated from the Acropolis by the Choaspes; see n. on 4, 17. 𐤇^{VI}, incorrectly, ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει. Contrast וְהָעִיר שׁוּשַׁן נְבוּכָד (at the end of c. 3) and בְּרֹחַב הָעִיר (6, 11). See also n. on 9, 6.

(3) Before חֵל we must insert וְשָׂרִי; so R (in K) and S.

For הַפְּרִתָּמִים = Assy. paršûmûti (HW 546) = זְקִנִּים *cf.* AJP 17, 490.

(4) The statement (AoF 3, 31, n. 1) that the original meaning of this passage was undoubtedly that the King gave a banquet *after* having displayed his power is untenable; בְּהָרָאָתוֹ cannot mean *after having*

shown. Neither Θ^Y καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ τὸ δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς nor Θ^L εἰς τὸ ἐπι-
δειχθῆναι (*ut ostenderet*) are correct. The emendation בהראתם is
gratuitous.

The 180 days may be an exaggeration, just as the 10,000 talents
(3, 9) or the 50 cubits (5, 14) or the 75,000 said to have been slain by the
Jews (9, 16) but the author undoubtedly intended to convey the idea
that the banquet lasted 180 days, *i.e.* half a year.

מִיָּמִים רַבִּים is a corrective gloss (or *variant*; cf. Ἀδὰρ Νίσαν in
 Θ^L 3, 7 and *Kings* 213, 48; 291, 4; *Nah.* 40, 5; also n. on וּבִגְדָתָא, v. 10,
and n. on 8, 6) to the following שְׁמוֹנִים וּמֵאָה יוֹם; it is omitted in
 Θ^{VL} . The glossator may have considered the 180 days an exaggeration;
cf. second n. on 6, 8.

(5) K^{ethiv} וּבִמְלֹאֹת, Q^{ere} וּבִמְלֹאֹת. The form is based on the
analogy of the verbs לָחַץ, the מ is silent; cf. סִחוּן (*Is.* 9, 4) *i.e.*
סוּן = סִחָן = סִחָן = Eth. ṣāṇ; see *Isaiah* 88, 39; *Kings* 274, 19;
280, 48.

מִגֵּבָה וְעַד קֶטַן means *both high and low*, not *old and young*;
the latter phrase is expressed by מִנֶּעַר וְעַד זָקֵן (3, 13). B interprets
מִגֵּבָה וְעַד קֶטַן correctly in the present verse; but in v. 20 he takes
it to mean *old and young*.

Instead of מִשְׁתֶּה it is better to point מִשְׁתָּה; cf. ψ 60, 5 and
Kings 173, 8. The צִי in this case indicates an accented short *e*; see
below, n. on v. 22; contrast THCO 209.

In חֲצֵר (حِيزَة, حِيزَة, حِيزَة) בַּחֲצֵר גִּנַּת בֵּיתָן הַמֶּלֶךְ
הַמֶּלֶךְ is according to Wn a gloss to גִּנַּת בֵּיתָן; but this is impossible.
 Θ^Y ἐν αὐλῇ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως omits גִּנַּת; Θ^L has ἐνδον ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ
βασιλέως. The feast was not given in the park: this would have ruined
the park; it was given in the forecourt of the royal park. This fore-
court (*D* in the groundplan of the Acropolis of Susa in Billerbeck's
Susa, p. 132) had a mosaic pavement. A mosaic pavement in the park
(*B*) would be very strange. Nor is E's banquet (c. 7) given in the
גִּנַּת; the King goes from E's banquet to the park (7, 7) and returns
from the park to the place of the banquet (7, 8). According to Ch (EB
4500) בֵּיתָן is a corruption of בִּטְנִי: *it was an orchard of pistachio
nut-trees that was meant!* It might just as well be explained as a slight
modification of יִרְהֲמָא! But בֵּיתָן is a Babyl. loanword (KAT³, 649)
derived from bitānu, *palace*. Cf. tarbaṣu ša bitāni in Behrens,
Briefe kultischen Inhalts (Leipzig, 1906) p. 39, n. 3. The idea (AoF
3, 2) that בֵּיתָן is an ideogram with phonetic complement (*n* + בֵּית =
appadan or maethana)* is impossible; see *Pur.* 48, 10. The punctu-

* Cf. N, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1887) p. 152 and my ASKT 165,
below.

ation ביתן is just as wrong as the vocalization of כרפס (v. 6) and אבן (8, 6). Cf. also יצע for יצע (4, 3).

(6) הור is an explanatory gloss to the following Pers. loanword כרפס = *κάρπασος*. A second explanatory gloss to כרפס is בוץ which must exchange places (cf. n. on 3, 11) with ותכלת. The transposition of בוץ and תכלת is probably due to 8, 15 where we find בוץ וארגמן; cf. the remarks on ביום קרה (Nah. 3, 17) in Nah. 33. For ארגמן ותכלת cf. my remarks in THCO 220. Both terms are Babyl. loanwords (KAT³, 649, n. 2). The prefixed gloss הור explains the color of the כרפס, while the affixed gloss בוץ describes the fine quality of the velarium (Ἐ⁴ σκακη⁴ τεταμένῃ, cf. *Et pendebant . . . tentoria*, ת הור פריסן יריען, § 101). Cf. *carbasus* Lucr. 6, 109.

For כרפס with ä (as in *κάρπασος*) we must point כרפס = Pers. کرباس, Syr. ܟܪܒܣܐ; cf. conclusion of n. on v. 5, also *Daniel* 21, 19.

Before כרפס we must insert the preposition תחת; this was probably displaced by the gloss הור; cf. n. on ואבנתא (instead of חרש) in v. 10 and n. on 3, 11; also Nah. 25 (*ad* 1, 11). There is a certain graphic similarity between הור and תחת; not only ו and ר are confounded (see above, *ad* v. 1) but also ו and ת: in בלו (Ezr. 4, 13, 20; 7, 24) e. g. the feminine ת of the Babyl. term biltu (from רבל) has been corrupted to ו; the original form may have been בלת; cf. Eth. ቢኒት: bēnāt (JAOS 13, lii, below; JBL 19, 77, below). On the other hand we find ת for ו in ותני תני; see Ezra 63, 2; cf. Ὀστάνης (אוסתן) Sachau, *Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine* (Berlin, 1907) pp. 26, 33; for אוסתן = וסתן cf. מואמה = ומה and Kings 118, 1. Contrast L, *Pur.* 52, below; also Βισθάνης (Arrian 3, 19, 4).

It is impossible to regard vv. 6, 7, with B and Wb, as exclamations; nor can we, with AV, supply at the beginning of v. 6: *where were* (in K's AT *dort gab es*; S *da war*).

הור does not mean *held, fastened* (Ἐ⁴ τεταμένους ἐπὶ σχοινίοις, *et sustentata funibus*, § 101) but *bound, bordered, edged*; Ger. *eingefasst*; so B and K; contrast Keil, Schultz, Wb, S (*befestigt*).

גלילי does not mean *rings* (§ 101, *et circuli*) or κύβου (Ἐ⁴) but *poles*; see my translation of Cant. 5, 14 in AJSL 18, 199; cf. THCO 234 and BL 10.

Before מטרות we must insert the preposition ב. It is not necessary to say על-מטרות, as in 7, 8; cf. AJSL 22, 201, 1. 11.

The terms בהט ושש ורר וסחרת seem to denote four varieties of marble: שש (= שיש 1 Chr. 29, 2) is *white marble* (cf. שיש = בוץ, *byssus*, i. e. *white lawn*; see the third paragraph of the nn. on the

present verse) = Assy. šaššu (*i. e.* šāšu; *cf.* laššu = lašu = لايس laisa; see *Proverbs* 51, 9.—מִבְּהַט, ἡ σμαραγδίνης may be *smaragdine marble*, *i. e.* probably *verd-antique*.—מִדָּר, ἡ πίννυς (*cf.* Arab. دُر durr, *pearls*) may be *lumachelle* or *shell-marble* (Ger. *Muschel-marmor*) which the ancient Persians may have obtained from the neighborhood of Astrakhan; the Astrakhan lumachelle is dark brown with orange shells. *Muschelkalk* (shell-limestone) is called in Assyrian pīlu or pūlu = πῶλος; see *AJSL* 23, 259, below; *Nah.* 16, n. 15.—Heb. סְהַרַת may be identical with Assy. sixru (HW 495^b) which is probably another name for šubû (HW 637^b) = שֻׁבֹּי (Ex. 28, 19; 39, 12) rendered in Ἑβ: ἀχάτης; so it may mean *onyx marble* which the Romans called *alabastrites*. Onyx is but a variety of agate. Delitzsch's conjecture (*Proleg.* 85) that šubû = שֻׁבֹּי denotes the *diamond*, is improbable.—The meaning of שֵׁשׁ is reasonably certain; the explanation of the three other terms is more or less conjectural.

(7) מִכִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ (cf. 2, 18 and 1 K 10, 13) is correctly paraphrased in Ἑ: *ut magnificentia regia dignum erat*; *cf.* *Kings* 186, 45.

(8) For כִּדָּת see below, *ad v.* 13.

מִן אֵינָהּ (לִית דַּאנִּיִּס) does not mean *no one urged* (Ἑ *nec erat qui nolentes cogeret ad bibendum*, § 2, 2, AV *none did compel*) but *no one restricted*; so, correctly, *Schultz.* *Cf.* the אִתְּחַת in the Talmudic passages *Ned.* 27^a; *Keth.* 16^b, cited in *Jastrow's dictionary*; also in *Dalman's Wörterbuch* אִתְּחַת is explained to mean *gehindert werden*. The stem אִתְּ means *to constrain*; this may mean either *to urge to action* or *to restrain from action*. The stem אִתְּ may be connected with Assy. urāsu, *overseer* (HW 136^b). For the change of *r* and *n* *cf.* נָשָׂא, *to lend* = Assy. rašû; טַמֵּן = טַמֵּן; *cf.* נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר (2, 6) = נְבוֹכַדְרֶצַּר and *ZDMG* 61, 195. But Heb. מִנֵּן does not correspond to Assy. magāru; this verb (HW 392) means originally *to fall down*, *to submit* (Ger. *sich unterwerfen*) = מִנֵּן ψ 89, 45.

For the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον על יסֹד *cf.* קִים על in 9, 21. 27 and in the gloss 9, 31.

The distributive repetition אִישׁ ואִישׁ (GK²⁷, § 123, c) is very common in E, just as the parentheses referred to above, in nn. on v. 1; the infinitive absolute instead of the finite verb, discussed below, in n. on הִנְהִיָּה (2, 18) and the use of Aramaic words, mentioned below, *ad* 4, 4; 7, 4; 9, 21. 23; *cf.* also the Aramaic forms and constructions discussed in nn. on 2, 9. 18. For the phrase אִישׁ ואִישׁ *cf.* מְדִינָה וּמְדִינָה, 1, 22; 3, 12. 14; 4, 3; 8, 9. 13;—עַם וְעַם, 1, 22; 3, 12; 8, 9;—יּוֹם וְיוֹם, 2, 11; 3, 4;—נֶעֱרָה וְנֶעֱרָה, 2, 12;—עִיר וְעִיר, 8, 9. 17.—שָׁנָה וְשָׁנָה, 9, 21. 27;—*cf.* especially 9, 28: מְשַׁפְּחָה וּמְשַׁפְּחָה מְדִינָה וּמְדִינָה עִיר וְעִיר.

According to the Talmud (Meg. 12^a; BT 3, 579) every guest received the wine of his native district (*cf.* \mathfrak{T}^2 224, 23; contrast 237, 5) just as at certain modern entertainments the guests are sometimes asked to order their favorite brand and vintage of champagne (אמר רבי אלעזר) (מלמד שכל אחד ואחד השקהו מין מדינתו).

(9) \mathfrak{M} רשתי may be identical with the name of the Elamite deity Mašti; see *Pur.* 10, 29. For γ = Assyr. *m* see n. on סיון (8, 9). *Cf.* also the name ורשתי; see n. on v. 6. \mathfrak{T}^2 238, 12 Vashti says: *I am the daughter of Evil-Merodach, grand-daughter of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon.* According to Ch (EB 5247) ורשתי is a corruption of אשורית, Assur being often used as a synonym for Jerahmeel! *Cf.* Ch's explanations of מרדכי (2, 5) and זרש (5, 10).

\mathfrak{M} בית is haplography for בבית (\mathfrak{T} בבית מלכותא). *Cf.* בית המלך, for בבית המלך, 4, 13, and contrast בבית המלכות, 5, 1; בבית המלך, 9, 4; בביתו, 1, 22; see *Kings* 301, 45.

\mathfrak{M} עשהה is pluperfect, as in 2, 1; see *Kings* 247, 16; *cf.* below, וחקר, v. 14; היה, 2, 5; הגידה, 2, 10; ידע, 4, 1, &c.

\mathfrak{M} אשר למלך אהשוורש is a scribal expansion; אהשוורש is a tertiary addition; *cf.* above, *ad* v. 1.

(10) The names of the seven chamberlains of the king are just as doubtful as the names of the seven councilors (v. 14) and the names of the ten sons of H (9, 7). The name חרבונה is mentioned again in 7, 9 as חרבונה, with final ה instead of א (*cf.* Ruth 1, 20 &c). The name בנתא seems to be miswritten for בנתא (6, 2) = בנתא (2, 21). *Cf.* the omission of the *n* in \mathfrak{G} Ἀρκσαῖος = \mathfrak{M} כרשנא and מרס = מרסנא (v. 14). The name of the fellow-conspirator of בנתא in 2, 21; 6, 2: תרש was displaced (*cf.* ZDMG 61, 286, l. 18; Nah. 25, l. 26; BL 62, n. 50) in the present passage by ואבנתא, which is merely a gloss (or *variant*; *cf.* last n. on v. 4) to בנתא with prefixed ו explicative (*cf.* *Pur.* 15, 31) just as מרסנא seems to be a variant of the preceding מרס (v. 14). But the name תרש is preserved in \mathfrak{G}^s .

\mathfrak{G}^v gives the following seven names: $\mathfrak{A}\mu\alpha\nu$, $\mathfrak{M}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$, $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\alpha$, $\mathfrak{B}\omega\pi\alpha\zeta\eta$, $\mathfrak{Z}\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\theta\alpha$, $\mathfrak{A}\beta\alpha\tau\alpha\zeta\alpha$, $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\alpha\beta\alpha$. The first name, $\mathfrak{A}\mu\alpha\nu$, is a corruption (or *adaptation*) of \mathfrak{M} מוהבן (\mathfrak{T} adds to מוהבן, v. 16: הו המן בר) (בריה דאנג רשינא).— $\mathfrak{M}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ = $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ = \mathfrak{M} בוזא.— $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\alpha$ = $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\sigma\alpha$ (*cf.* $\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ = $\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$, and the proper names $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ &c) = \mathfrak{M} תרש. In \mathfrak{G}^v the names בנתא ותרש are omitted in 2, 21; 6, 2; but in the apocryphal addition prefixed to the Book (v. 11 = \mathfrak{F} 12, 1) we find $\mathfrak{G}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ καὶ $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\alpha$. \mathfrak{G}^s $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha\nu$ καὶ $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in 2, 21 is a subsequent addition. $\mathfrak{G}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ is a transposition of $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$ (\mathfrak{F} *Bagatha*) = \mathfrak{M} בנתא; *cf.* \mathfrak{S} אבנותא (see below) = \mathfrak{M} בנתא, and \mathfrak{S} רהבונא = \mathfrak{M} הרבונא, also \mathfrak{S}^a שפירותא = \mathfrak{S}^a פשירותא for פרשנכתא (\mathfrak{M} פרשנכתא) in 9, 7. \mathfrak{G}^l 1, 11 has for \mathfrak{G}^v $\mathfrak{G}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ καὶ

Θαρρα the names Αστας (*var.* Ασταγος) καὶ Θεδεντος, Josephus (*Ant.* 11, 6, 4) Βαγαθως καὶ Θεοδεστης (= תרש, with ד for ר). The *Vetus Latina* has in 2, 21: *Bartageus et Thedestes*. According to W 19 the original name was Θεόδοτος. But even if Θεδεντος and Θεοδέστης were corruptions of Θεόδοτος, this name would be a Greek adaptation like φρονται for ΦΟΥΡΑΙ = ΦΟΥΡΑΙ; see n. on 9, 23.—Θ^v Αβαταζα seems to be a corruption of אבנתא אבנתא (Αβαταζα = אבנתא = אבנתא = אבנתא) just as אבנתא appears in Θ^a as Ζηβαθαθα (*i.e.* אבנתא = אבנתא) and in Θ^v as Βωραζη (= Βωγαζη = Βωγαθη; *cf.* Ζωσαρα = זרש, 5, 10).—Θ^v Ζαθολθα (for Ζαθορθα) = אבנתא.—Θ^v Θαραβα (Θ^a Θαβαζ) = אבנתא (Θαραβα = Βαραθα = ברס = ברנס = ברנס; *cf.* § below).

אבנתא does not appear in Θ^v, but Θ^a has instead of Θ^v Θαρρα (for Θαρσα) = תרש the name Θαρβωα which is a corruption of הרבונא. In 7, 9 Θ^v has for אבנתא the name Βογαθαν which seems to correspond to אבנתא (for אבנתא; see above). Θ^l Αγαθας (*var.* Γαβουθας = Θ^v Βογαθαν; *cf.* Θ^v Γαβαθα = אבנתא, 12, 1, = אבנתא; also ὁ Ἀχραθαῖος = Ἀθαχαῖος = התך, 4, 9, and Γαβουζα = Γαζουβα = עזובה, *Kings* 176, 33) may have been influenced by the Greek names Ἀγαθᾶς, Ἀγαθος, &c. According to Jewish tradition Harbonah was a good man; he is blessed with M and E after the reading of the Megillah at the Feast of Purim. The transposition in אבנתא may represent a similar adaptation; אבנתא suggested the verbs חָנַן, חָנַן, to have pity and compassion; *cf.* חָנַן, חָנַן, compassionate and merciful; חָנַן, חָנַן, tender-hearted and benign. For ב = מ = פ *cf.* AJSL 23, 235, n. 46; also n. on 9, 9. The name הרבונא suggested destruction; *cf.* חָנַן and חָנַן = חָנַן (SG² § 128, B). *Cf.* the remarks on μονχαῖος and βογαῖος in the nn. on v. 14.

§ reads למהומן, to the eunuchs, instead of אבנתא (for אבנתא *cf.* the remarks on אבנתא = אבנתא) adding after אבנתא the name תרש which corresponds to the third name in Θ^v, Θαρρα. The names in §, after the prefixed למהומן, are: אבנתא אבנתא. Apart from the preservation of תרש, which is omitted in אבנתא, and the interpretation of אבנתא as למהומן, to the eunuchs, the names in § are practically identical with those in אבנתא. The differences consist in transpositions and other slight graphic variations (ב for כ &c). For אבנתא Θ^a has אבנתא. For the transposition אבנתא = אבנתא *cf.* Θ^l Ἀρκεσαῖος = אבנתא, v. 14; Γαβαθα = Βαγαθα = אבנתא; Γαβουθας = Βογαθαν = אבנתא; also Θ^a Αψαμ for Αψαν (3, 1).

§ Mauman, Bazatha, Harbona, Bagatha, Abgatha, Zethar, Char-chas follows אבנתא; so, too, Θ.

The derivation of סרים from Assy. ša reši (ZDMG 53, 116) seems to me impossible; for ס = Assy. ש cf. אסתר = Ištar; see *Kings* 270, 26.

(12) Heb. מֵאֵן, *to refuse* (cf. Syr. ܡܢܐܢ ܐܢܐ, *it is not tedious to me, I do not mind*, Eth. መሰን; mannána, *to reject*; Arab. مماننة mumâ'ana, *deliberation*) may be a secondary Piel derived from the interrogative pronoun מֵן, *what?* (cf. Assy. minû, *how?* and minû, *what?*) i.e. a compound of the interrogative pronoun מִי, *who?* *what?* and the interrogative particle הֵא: nu (cf. n. on 7, 5). Heb. ותמאן meant originally *she said, What!* Cf. AJSJL 22, 259 and WdG 1, § 67, d, also וַיִּהָס (Num. 13, 30) from הָס.

מֵשֶׁתִּי is scribal expansion; cf. the remarks on המלך דוד in nn. on v. 1. 𐤔^v has Αστιν ἡ βασιλισσα for מֵשֶׁתִּי; in v. 11 𐤔^v has simply τῇ βασιλισσᾶν for מֵשֶׁתִּי המלכה.

(13) מֵשֶׁ דְּבַר means here *procedure*; cf. v. 17 and דְּבַר מִדְּבָרֵי (3, 4) also דְּבַר הַצִּוּמוֹת (9, 31) and דְּבַר הַפְּרִים (9, 32).

In דִּין וְדִין (אוריתא ודינא, 𐤁𐤓𐤏𐤍 𐤁𐤓𐤏𐤍, 𐤔^{VL} νόμον καὶ κρίσιν, *leges ac jura majorum*, AV *law and judgment*, LB *Recht und Händel*) the term דִּין is not added as an explanation of דִּת (S). The meanings of the two terms are entirely different: דִּת denotes especially a *personal* or *executive act*, while דִּין denotes a *legislative act*; דִּת is a *royal decree* (דְּבַר מַלְכוּת, v. 19; cf. כֹּדֶת 1, 8; 2, 12; 4, 16 and the last paragraph of nn. on 1, 14) or *edict*, and דִּין means *consuetudinary law* including the *ecclesiastical* (ceremonial, ritual) *law*; in Arabic the term دین dīn is therefore used for *religion*. The term דְּתִים corresponds to the decisions of the Roman emperors, which were called *decrees* (Lat. *decreta*) and formed part of the *imperial constitutions* (Lat. *constitutiones principum*). Cf. v. 19: יֵצֵא דְּבַר מַלְכוּת וּיִפְתַּח בְּרִית בֵּין פֶּרֶס וּמִדֵּי. Heb. דִּת is a Pers. loanword (cf. *Ezra* 63, 18) and means lit. *what is given* (Lat. *datum*). Heb. דִּין, on the other hand, is a Babyl. loanword (KAT³, 650 below) which may ultimately be, not Semitic, but Sumerian (SD 527, 1). Babyl. dīnu corresponds to Sumer. di=din, just as qanû, *reed* is derived from Sum. gi=gin (CV 9). For the vanishing of final consonants in Sumerian see SFG 49; ASKT 136, l. 7; CV 8; and for the preservation of silent final consonants in loanwords cf. *Pur.* 16, 32 (also גִּנּוּךְ = גִּנָּה).

(14) For מֵשֶׁ הִקְרִיב we must point הִקְרִיב, *he caused to come near*, i.e. *he summoned* (cf. Josh. 7, 16; 1 S 10, 20; Jer. 30, 21) or *he had summoned* (cf. the n. on עֲשֵׂתָהּ, v. 9). S's conjecture הִקְרִיב (1 K 5, 7) is not good. 𐤔^v καὶ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ (𐤔^l προσῆλθον) does not presuppose a different consonantal text; the Hiphil הִקְרִיב may be

intransitive; cf. Ex. 14, 10 and Kings 174, 27; nor need we read the plural, דקריבין לוחיה ט. ויקרב (see Kings 170, n. *) or דקריבין לוחיה ט. דקריבין.

The names of the seven councilors are just as doubtful as the names of the seven chamberlains in v. 10; שתר might be identical with the first part of the name שתר בוזי, but the initial ש may be a corruption of מ; see Ezra 34, 5.—For חרשי cf. 1 Chr. 7, 10 where this name is followed by אחישתר which has been combined with the cuneiform Axseri given in the cuneiform account of the fourth campaign of Sardanapalus (KB 2, 177, l. 126) as the name of the King of Man (or Van; cf. n. on ורשתי, v. 9) between Lake Van and Lake Urumiah; cf. Ninth Annual Report of the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, 1884) p. 28. According to TBAI 166 שתר and חרשי are corruptions of אשתר, while אחישתר is a slightly modified form of אשתר!—אשר may be a shorter form of the following name מרסנא (cf. n. on גלב וגלבי, Nah. 35) just as בנתנא (= בנתן) is a shorter form of the following אבנתא (v. 10).—The name ממוכן appears also in vv. 16 and 21.

For the seven names of א (3 Charsena, Sethar, Admatha, Tharsis, Mares, Marsana, Mamuchan) א^v has but three, viz. Ἀρκεσαῖος, Σαρσαθαῖος (Α^a Σαρσεθεος) and Μαλησεαρ. In vv. 16, 21 Α has ὁ Μουχαῖος for ממוכן; this may be a Greek adaptation, just as φρουραί, vigils for פורים (see nn. on 9, 23) and βονγάιος, braggart for Γωγάιος = גאגיי (see n. on 3, 1). For the article cf. the remarks on ὁ Μαρδοχαῖος = מרדכי (2, 5) and GK²⁷, § 125, d. Μουχαῖος, it may be supposed, was regarded as a dialectic by-form of μοιχικός, adulterous; cf. Æolian Μοῖσα = Μοῦσα, Μοισαῖος = Μουσαῖος. This councilor may have been called ὁ μουχαῖος, because he advises the King to divorce the Queen; cf. Matt. 5, 32 and the remarks on א רחבונא for א חרבונא in nn. on v. 10. א^u has βονγάιος for ὁ μουχαῖος; cf. nn. on אהנא (2, 3) and האנגי (3, 1).—Α Ἀρκεσαῖος corresponds to א חרשנא; cf. the transposition of the ר in א רחבונא = א חרבונא and the omission of the נ in מרסנא = בנתנא. The form of the name in Α may have been influenced by Greek names like Ἀρκεσος, Ἀρκέσας &c; cf. the remarks on Α Αγαθας (7, 9) in nn. on א רחבונא, v. 10.—The third name in Α, Μαλησεαρ, evidently corresponds to א מרסנא (מרס) with l for r, and r for n; cf. my remarks on Λάρισσα = Rêš-ini (Heb. רסן) in ZDMG 61, 284 and Nah. 45, below.—Consequently the three names in Α correspond to חרשנא, מרסנא, and ממוכן in א. Α omits שתר אדמתא חרשי after חרשנא, and מרס before מרסנא. Α may have regarded שתר אדמתא

מרס and * (?שטר אדמת תרשיש) כרשנא as appositive to תרשיש as undeleted corrigendum (*cf.* גרב גובי, *Nah.* 35) for מרסנא. For various spellings of the same name *cf.* *Kings* 275, 29. In \mathfrak{G}^4 four of the names of the ten sons of H have dropped out. It is possible, however, that the additional names of \mathfrak{H} in the present passage are due to scribal expansion. *Cf.* also \mathfrak{T}^2 (238, 24).

§ reads **ברנשי ואשתר רמוס חרשי מסררא מעוק**. Here the names **ברנשי** and **חרשי** are transposed, **חרשי** appearing after **רמוס** (= **רמס**) instead of preceding it. Apart from the transpositions and other slight graphic variations, the names in § are again (cf. v. 10) practically identical with those in **מט**. The corruption **ברנשי** (for **כרנשי**) is obvious; **§**^A has **ברנשי**. The prothetic **א** of **ואשתר** is not found in **§**^A; for **ארמות** **§**^A has **ארמת**; for **רמוס** **§**^A has **רמוס**. See also Marquard, *Fundamente*, pp. 68–73, cited EB 1402, n. 2.

(15) The סוף פסוק at the end of v. 14 must be inserted after כרת at the beginning of v. 15; (באוריתא) belongs to the preceding clause (contrast n. on 2, 6). We must read: *הישיבים ראשונה במלכות*: כרת, *who held the first rank in the kingdom according to a (royal) decree (patent)*. Cf. n. on דת ודין (v. 13) and *כי כן צוה לו המלך* (3, 2). The prefixed כרת before the question *מה לעשות* would be very strange. There is no כרת before *מה לעשות* in 6, 6; nor do ע"פ express it in the present passage. *אֲנִי מֵעַתָּה לֹא חֹמֶס לְעַמְּךָ* is merely a free rendering of *מה לעשות במלכה*. Contrast Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 3, 34.

(16) Kethiv ממוכן; Q^{re}θ ממוכן, as in vv. 14. 21. ⁵⁷ δ μουχαῖος, ⁵⁸ βογυῖος, ⁵⁹ ماموكان, ⁶⁰ Mamuchan. ⁶¹ Μαμουχαῖος is a subsequent correction for μουχαῖος.

(17) מלכות means *procedure, behavior, attitude*; cf. v. 13. The following המלכה is not *genitivus objectivus* (GK²⁷, § 128, h; cf. n. on 4, 11). $\text{Ὁ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ ὡς ἀντίπε τῷ βασιλεῖ}$ is a doublet; cf. the rendering of רצים (3, 13) in טל . For the explicative καὶ see *Pur.* 16, 15.† Ἄ sermo, ὧς מלכות פחגם גזירת (cf. v. 19: פחגם גזירת מלכות).

For *אֵל* על read *אֵל*; cf. 4, 5: *וּתְצַוֵּהוּ עַל מַדְרֵכֵי* (for *אֵל*) and contrast 7, 7: *אֵלֶיךָ* (for *עֲלֶיךָ*) also 9, 10: *אֵל הַיְּהוּדִים* (for *עַל*). See *Nah.* 20, *ad* v. 9.

The suffix in **באמרם** does not refer exclusively to the women; both men and women will say: The King commanded Queen Vashti to

*Assyr. šapātu (*HW* 684^a) = שפט or axṭā for axṭū (*HW* 273^a, 1,2) do not prove interchange of ט and פ; cf. n. on נפטר, *Nah.* 35. חטה = قتل, קטל = חטה = תעה = תעה; שהחש = קשת, צבת = צבט, &c the ו is due to partial assimilation: see AJSJL 23, 248, below.

† See also Moses Schörr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 171, below.

appear before him, and she did not come. But even if באמרים referred exclusively to the women, it would not be necessary to substitute באמור; see *Kings* 83, 35.

(18) For וְכָדִי (כְּמִיסַת ט) we must read וְכָדִי, *whenever*; cf. v. 22 בלשון for כללשון and 3, 4 (Kethiv באמרים, Q^rè כְּאִמְרִים) also Nah. 47 (כְּדִי for בְּדִי) and § כְּרִשְׁנָא for כְּרִשְׁנֵי, v. 14. The ו prefixed to קִצָּה is the *Waw apodosis* (GK²⁷, § 143, d) cf. וַיִּגִּידוּ, 3, 4; וַהֲיָה, 4, 11; וַיִּנְתֵּן, 5, 3, 6; וַיִּנְתֵּן and וַיַּעַשׂ, 5, 6; 7, 2; 9, 12; וַיִּמְלֹא, 5, 9; וַיִּסְרִיסִי, 6, 14; וַיִּנְהַפֹּךְ, 9, 1; also the gloss in Eccl. 5, 6: כִּי־בְרֵךְ הַלְמוֹת, *in many a dream there are vanities*. The phrase וְכָדִי בַדִּין and וְכָדִי וְקִצָּה means: *Whenever there is contempt* (disrespect, disobedience, on the part of the women) *there is wrath* (on the part of the princes). Heb. בָּדִי, *whenever* (Job 39, 25) means lit. *in the sufficiency, abundance, frequency*; for דִּי cf. *Proverbs* 61, 6. The Versions did not understand the phrase: ט, וְכָדִי יִיכֹל לְסוּבְרָא כְּמִיסַת הוּךְ דִּין וְרִגְזָא ט, unde *regis justa est indignatio*. B's *sie werden reden, und zwar nach Genüge Verachtung und Zorn* is impossible. AV, *Thus* (shall there arise) *too much contempt and wrath*. Similarly Wd (following R in K) *und nach Genüge Verachtung und Verdruss* (*wird es geben*) and S *und es wird dem entsprechend Geringschätzung und Ärger* (*geben*) but in his nn. S states correctly that the בַּדִּין will be on the part of the ladies, and the קִצָּה on the part of their husbands.

(19) For the phrases וַיֵּיטֵב בְּעֵינֵי אִם עַל הַמֶּלֶךְ טוֹב (cf. 3, 9) and וַיֵּיטֵב בְּעֵינֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ see *Kings* 137, 17.

The omission of הַמֶּלֶכָה after וַשְׁתִּי is intentional; ℣^v, however, has ἡ βασίλισσα instead of וַשְׁתִּי; § ܡܠܟܬܐ ܡܠܟܬܐ. Contrast n. on הַמֶּלֶכָה instead of אַחֲתֵר in 4, 4.

ܡܠܟܬܐ ܠܪܥܘܬܐ (§ ܡܠܟܬܐ ܠܪܥܘܬܐ) means simply *to another woman*; cf. ٢٤ 1 S 28, 17 (לְדוֹר is gloss) and Neh. 2, 1 (see *Kings* 74, 7).

ܡܠܟܬܐ ܡܝܡܢܐ does not mean *who is more beautiful than she* (this would be טוֹבַת מְרֹאֶה; cf. v. 11; 2, 2, 3, 7) but *who is better than she*, who is superior to her. ℣^v γυναικὶ κρείττονι αὐτῆς, ℣^u ἀλλῇ κρείττονι οὐσῇ αὐτῆς, § altera quae melior est illa, AV *unto another that is better than she*. The new queen is to be just as beautiful as Vashti, but of a sweeter disposition, not so ill-tempered. The idea of the author was no doubt that Vashti's refusal to obey the King's command was simply due to her bad humor (so, correctly, S, *ad* v. 12) although N (EB 1403) says, It has been well remarked by A. H. Niemeyer that the most respectable character in the Book is Vashti who declines to exhibit her charms before the crowd of revelers. According to ٢٤ (224, 27; 237, 30) the King commanded the Queen to appear *naked* (עֲרִילְתָא) before his guests.

(20) The clause **כִּי רַבָּה הִיא** (omitted in \mathfrak{S}^v ; ܟܝܪܒܗ ܗܝܐ) is concessive: *although it is great, however great it be*; cf. *Proverbs* 39, 35; *OLZ* 10, 65, n. 3; *Nah.* 39 (*ad Jer.* 50, 11). \mathfrak{S} renders correctly: *so gross es ist*; but the explanation given in his nn. is not satisfactory (*cf. n. on 4, 7*).

According to B the phrase **לְמִנְדּוֹל וְעַד קָטָן** means here, not *noble and mean* (so, correctly, Schultz and \mathfrak{S} ; *cf. העמיים* and *השירים*, v. 16) as in v. 5, but *old and young*. \mathfrak{S}^v ἀπὸ πτωχῶν ἕως πλουσίου, \mathfrak{S}^L ἀπὸ πτωχῶν ἕως πλουσίων.

(22) Heb. **סֵפֶר** (*i. e. séfr*; see *Nah.* 29, below) is an Assyrian loan-word and means originally *message* = Assyrian *šipru*; see *Kings* 198, 47. Assyrian *šapāru*, *to send* is a Šaphel of **פָּר**; see *Nah.* 24, below; *cf. n. on שִׁקְלָה (3, 9).*

The last clause of c. 1, **וּמִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ**, which is omitted in \mathfrak{S}^v , is a late gloss; in *Meg.* 12^b (BT 3, 581) the phrase **שׂוֹר בְּבִיתוֹ** is discussed, but there is no reference to **וּמִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ**. The meaning is: *he is to talk plainly to her, as we say to talk plain English or United States*, Ger. *mit dem werde ich einmal Deutsch reden*, French *je vais lui parler français* or *je vous le dis en bon français*; *cf. my remarks on اعراب*, *JBL* 19, 66. The modern Yiddish phrase is *mámme lóshen reden*, *to talk in the mother tongue* (*mámme* = *mamma*, *mother*, and *lóshen* = **לָשׁוֹן**, *tongue*). An Alexandrian Jew in such a case talked to his wife, not in Hebrew, but in the language of his people, *i. e.* in plain Greek, just as a Jewish rabbi in Berlin would talk to his wife in such a case, not in Hebrew, but in German; *cf. the last n. on 8, 9*. But **τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ** (2 Macc. 7, 8. 21. 27) does not mean *in der Landessprache* (so Kamphausen in K) but *in the paternal (or ancestral) language*, *i. e. in Hebrew (or Aramaic)*. The *language of the country* would be **ἡ ἐπιχώριος φωνή**. Lat. *patrius sermo* is in Greek: **ἡ ἰδία γλῶττα**.

Et hoc per cunctos populos divulgari (AV *that it should be published according to the language of every people*) is a guess. **מִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ** could not have this meaning, even if we pointed **מִדְבַּר** instead of **מִדְבָּר**. The emendation **כָּל שׂוֹהָ עִמּוֹ** (proposed by Hitzig and accepted by Rawlinson, Reuss, Orelli, O, B, R, K; but not by Wd and \mathfrak{S}) is impossible (*cf. n. on 5, 11*). In the first place, we should expect **כָּל שׂוֹהָ לּוֹ** (*cf. 3, 8; 5, 12*) and even if we read **וּמִדְבַּר כָּל שׂוֹהָ לּוֹ**, it could mean only *and talk what is proper for him*, implying a restriction; **מִן סֵף** means *it is meet and right*. *To talk as he pleases* would be **וּמִדְבַּר כְּרָצוֹנוֹ** (*cf. 1, 8; 9, 5*) or **כְּאֵנָת** **כִּחְפֵּץ לְבוֹ** or **נַפְשׁוֹ**. For **כָּלשׁוֹן** read **בָּלְשׁוֹן**; *cf. כְּדִי* for *כָּדִי*, v. 18. **לְמַהֲרִי מִמְלָלָא** follows **מִן סֵף**. \mathfrak{T} interprets: **וּמִתְחַלֵּל הֵיךְ לִישָׁן עִמֶּיהָ**; **כְּלִישָׁן גְּבֵרָא וּכְמִמְלָל עִמֶּיהָ**.

ב

(1) **זכר את ושתי** **א**, *he remembered Vashti* means *he could not forget her*; he thought of her with affection and was inclined to reinstate her. The insertion of the negative in **א** *οὐκ ἔτι ἐμνήσθη* is just as gratuitous as in Eccl. 11, 9 or in **א** *מִלֵּן מִלֵּן מִלֵּן מִלֵּן* at the end of c. 2; cf. the remarks on **א** *לֹא יִזְרַע מִשְׁמֵךְ עוֹד* in Nah. 26.

(3) **א** *את כל נערה* is correct; contrast S and GK²⁷, § 117, d; cf. the three Pharisaic glosses in Eccl. 3, 15: **והאלהים יבקש את-נרדך**; 7, 7: **גם את-העלם נתן בלבם**; 3, 11: **וראבד את-לב מתנה**; see Nah. 32. For **א** cf. Proverbs 51, 17. According to B. Luther (in IN 79. 119) **א** *את בת לוי* (Ex. 2, 1) means, not *a daughter of Levi*, a Levitess, but *the daughter of Levi*, so that Moses would be a grandson of Jacob.

For **א** *הגאי* (in the scribal expansion derived from v. 8)* read **א** *הגאי*, as in v. 8. **א** *Egeus*, **א** *הגאי*; **א** *Gai*, as though the initial **ה** were the article, while **א** substitutes in the present gloss: *Γωγαίος*, and in the original passage (v. 8): *βουγαίος*. For these two names in **א** see below, ad 3, 1; cf. the remarks on *βουγαίος* = *μουχαίος* = **א** *ממוכ* in nn. on 1, 14.

(5) For the introductory clause cf. the beginning of the Book of Job. **א** *היה* is pluperfect; cf. n. on **א** *עשתה* (1, 9). We must translate: *Now there had been* (for a long time) *a Jewish man in the Acropolis of Susa*.

The name **א** *מרדכי* is derived from the name of the chief god of Babylon, Marduk (*Pur.* 10, 26) = **א** *מרדך* instead of *מרדך* (with **ר**; cf. **א** *סרגון*). Cf. the remarks on the transposition of vowels in nn. on **א** *אחשוורוש* (1, 1). The form **א** *מרדכי*, given in Baer's **א**, is better than the usual punctuation **א** *מרדכי* (**א** *מרדכי*) but the original pronunciation must have been **א** *מרדכי* (**א** *מרדוכאי*) = **א** *Μαρδοχαίος*, **א** *Mardochæus*; see Ezra 58, 41. **א** combines the name with **א** *מירא דכיא*, *pure myrrh*. **א**, as a rule, prefixes the article, *ὁ Μαρδοχαίος*; cf. *ὁ Μουχαίος* = **א** *ממוכ* (1, 14) and *ὁ Ἀραθαίος* = **א** *התך* (4, 9) also *ὁ Ἀμαν* in **א** (5, 9) where **א** omits the article, and *ὁ Γαלי* = **א** *גהזי* (see Kings 192, 23). The Herodotean prototype of M is Otanes; the Maccabean prototype is Jonathan (see *Pur.* 8, 22; 6, 36) but the name M is Babylonian. The author of E would not have given his Jewish hero and heroine (for E = Istar see above, p. 119) names connected with heathen deities, unless M (*ὁ Μαρδοχαίος*) and E had been the familiar names of some favorite characters in the popular festal legends and dramatic plays (*Pur.* 38, 31) for the

* Cf. the scribal expansions (derived from 3, 13) at the end of 8, 11 and 8, 3 (derived from 9, 25) also the glosses at the end of 9, 2 and 3 (derived from the end of c. 8) and the two scribal expansions (derived from 9, 22 and 10) in 9, 16. See further nn. on **א** *דברי הימים* and **א** *שמרי הסה* (6, 2) and second n. on 6, 8.

(Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (*Pur.* 11, 31). According to Ch (EB 3198) M derived his name, not from Marduk (so, too, C 50, below) but from Jerahmeel: Abihail is most probably a popular corruption of Jerahmeel, Kish = Cushi, and the true name of M may have been Carmeli; cf. the Jerahmeelitish explanations of the names Vashti (1, 9) and Shethar, Tarshish (1, 14) and contrast IN 400, 1.

(6) מֵאֵשֶׁר יְמִינִי אִישׁ refers to מִרְדִּכִּי; the סוֹף בְּסוֹךְ should be after קִישׁ; contrast last n. on 1, 14. The genealogy, בֶּן יֵאִיר בֶּן קִישׁ שְׁמֵי בֶן קִישׁ, is parenthetical. Jair (about 600 B.C.) is M's father; Shimei (about 1000 B.C.) and Saul's father, Kish (about 1050) are two of his famous ancestors; cf. the complete genealogies of M in ט 7, 6; ט² 2, 5. C 52 deems it impossible that Kish in the present passage represents the father of Saul. ט inserts between Shimei and Kish the name of Shimei's father, Gera. Shimei is named, because he considered himself at least as good as David; just as M, the descendant of the first king of Israel, considered himself at least as good as the barbarian H (see *ad* 3, 4). M is introduced as a descendant of Saul, not as a son of David, because under the reign of the Maccabean princes descendants of David were not *personæ gratæ* (see *Pur.* 23, 31). For יֵאִיר = בִּיאִיר, the Heb. form of the Jewish name *Meier*, *Meyer*, &c, see BA 1, 170, below.

For נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר we had better read נְבוּכֶדְנֶצַּר = Σ Ναβουχοδονοσορ = Babyl. Nabû-kudurri-uṣur. For the correct pronunciation of mispointed cuneiform names see *Kings* 270, 16. The best form is the K^{ethiv} in Jer. 49, 28: נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר. The *o* of the final syllable seems to be preserved also in נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר (Ezr. 2, 1) unless the ך is merely due to dittography of the ר; cf. the remarks on אֶחָשֶׁרֶשׁ (1, 1) for אֶחָשֶׁרֶשׁ. The ך (which was assimilated to the preceding consonant; cf. הֶסֶךְ = xiṭṭ = xiṭ', SFG 11, below; VG 127, δ) is found also in the spelling נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר; the ר instead of ך (cf. nn. on אֶסֶךְ, 1, 8, = Assy. urâsu) in נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר. The *n* instead of *r* is due to dissimilation (contrast Aram. תְּרִין for תְּנִין). We have no right to restore throughout נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר (with ר and ך) just as it would be pedantic to substitute in the text of an English author *sycomore* for *sycamore*, or *Nazirite* for *Nazarite*. The omission of the ך and the substitution of ך for ר no doubt represent the actual pronunciation. The ך is certainly not due to graphic corruption, while the alleged preservation of the *o* in the final syllable צֶרֶךְ (Ezra 26, 51) may be due to dittography of the ר.

(7) מֵהַדָּסָה, *Myrtle* (cf. Μυρρίνη, Μυράς, &c) corresponds to the Babyl. xadaššatu, *bride*; for הָ = ח and ס = cuneiform ש see *Pur.* 39, 20.* This name is not given in Σ^{VL}; Ἰ Edissa; שׁ הַדָּסָה. The

* According to TBAI 166, n. 3, הַדָּסָה is doubtless derived from שְׁחַר[א]. Cf. Ch's explanation of רֶשֶׁתִּי (1, 9).

stems of Assy. xadaššatu (with خ) and Syr. ܕܚܕܬܐ (ܕܚܬܐ, SG², § 26, B, with ح) are not identical; but Aram. ܕܚܬܐ , myrtle may be a contraction of xadaššatu (see *Pur.* 39, 23) and ܕܚܬܐ may be connected also with ܐܕܐܣܐ (= ܕܚܬܐ , *Nova*) i.e. the name of the place where Nicanor, the prototype of H (*Nah.* 26, 1; 30, 4) was defeated on the 13th of Adar, 161 B.C. (*Pur.* 9, 26). *Alasa*, the name of the place where Judas Maccabæus was slain, may be an intentional alteration of *Adasa*; see *Pur.* 38, 39.

בַּת דָּוִד , the daughter of his uncle (the brother of his father) means, of course, his *cousin* (cf. the extract from Maqrizî in L, *Purim*, p. 13) not his *niece*. Wd (169, below) calls E *M's cousin*, but in the introduction to c. 2 he refers to her as *M's niece*; so, too, p. 181, l. 10; on p. 186 (*bis*) he calls M *E's uncle*. The same mistake is made by N (EB 1400-7) and S (149, l. 8 from the bottom). Cf. also W 17, 18; C 49, 10; 57, 17; 78, 15. In C 53, 8 E's father, Abihail, is said to be a cousin of M. B (400) has correctly *cousin*, not *niece*. Θ^v inserts between $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ and $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ the name Αμεινδαβ ; see nn. on v. 15.

יֵשֶׁת הָאֵר refers to the *figure*; טוֹבַת מַרְאֵה , to the *face*; תָּאֵר cannot be derived from רָאָה , it is a secondary modification of תָּוֵר , *turn* in the sense of *form, shape*; cf. n. on דְּמִיּוּקֵי (Cant. 7, 2) AJSL 18, 217. The *a* in תָּאֵר is on a par with the Pathah furtive. Cf. also *Kings* 167, 37.

Instead of $\text{לִבַּת לֹו מִרְדֵּכִי}$ ($\text{לִקְחָהּ לֹו מִרְדֵּכִי}$) Θ^v ($\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omega$) $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha$ seems to have read לְבִית . According to Rabbi Meir (Meg. 13^a, quoted C 62, below; J 46, below) we should read לְבִית instead of לִבַּת ; cf. BT 3, 584 ($\text{לִבַּת אֵלָּא לְבִית}$). The word בֵּית , *house* is used in the Talmud for *wife*. The original form of בֵּית , *house* was ba't, see AJSL 22, 258, below; for bat = bint, *daughter* see *Pur.* 50, 25. I , correctly, *Mardocheus sibi eam adoptavit in filiam*; S ܠܒܬܐ ܠܡܪܕܚܐ , Θ^2 ܠܒܬܐ ܠܡܪܕܚܐ .

(9) וַיַּבְהֵל (וַאֲזַהֵר) Θ^2 (taṣāḥḥā) does not mean *he hastened* (I *accelerare*, S ܐܝܬܪܐ) but *he took a special interest*; cf. French *s'empresser* (*S*, *betrieb eifrig*). The cosmetic treatment could not be *hastened*; a period of twelve months was prescribed by a royal decree (v. 12) and E had to await her turn (v. 15). Nor did Hegai *hasten* to send E her meals; she was not starving. But he took a special interest in E and gave special orders concerning her cosmetic treatment and her meals; cosmetic treatment without proper diet does not help very much. Hegai also devoted special attention to the selection of E's seven maids. His experienced eye saw that E was likely to become queen (contrast C 58, 12).

For the position after the object of the infinitive לַחַת לָהּ (which is more Aram. than Heb.) see K's *Aram. Gr.* §§ 75, 84; GK²⁷, § 142, f, n. 2. Cf. Dan. 2, 46: וּבִמְנַחָה וּנְיָחִיחַן אָמַר לְנִסְכָּהּ לָהּ; — 2, 10: לֹא אִחִי אָנֹכִי עַל יִפְשָׁתָא דִּי מִלַּת מַלְכָּא יֻכַּל לְהַחְיָה; — 6, 24: לַחַת לָהּ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ, וּלְדַנְיָאֵל אָמַר לְהִנְסָקָהּ מִן גִּבְא, which appears in אַחַר הַנְּעֻרוֹת הָרִאשִׁית, is more appropriate after מְנוּחֶיהָ; אַחַר לָהּ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ is probably a misplaced correction of לַחַת לָהּ 1°; cf. *Pur.* 47, 41.

(10) אַחַר הַנְּעֻרוֹת is pluperfect; cf. n. on עֲשָׂתָה (1, 9). The objection raised by several commentators, that the Persian officers could not fail to discover E's Jewish extraction, is not valid. The officials in charge of a royal harem pay very little attention to the race and faith of an odalisque; any girl יִפְתָּ תֹאֵר וְטוֹבָה מִרָאָה is eligible.* E was not asked any questions; but, at the advice of M, she did not talk of her Jewish extraction, because this might have spoiled her chances of becoming Queen. *Ἔ quae noluit indicare ei populum et patriam suam* is misleading. See also nn. on 3, 4.

(11) אַחַר חֲצֵר אֵל means *opposite* (or *in front of*) the forecourt, שָׁ קֶדֶם דְּרֹחָא דִּי בְּבֵית נְשִׂיאָא, מִן יָמֵי נָא. M did not enter the forecourt of the harem; cf. 4, 2. 6. Wd raises the question how it was possible that a man could talk to a girl from the royal harem, and how her Jewish extraction could be kept secret under those circumstances. Similarly N (EB 1401) says that M was able to communicate freely with his niece (contrast n. on בֵּית דֹּרִי, v. 7) in the harem. S states: *über die Schwierigkeit, wie M* (S, throughout, Mordehai, as though it were מִרְדֵּחַי! cf. n. on 4, 7) *ohne Eunuch† zu sein im Frauenvorhofe sich blicken lassen durfte und E dort sprechen konnte, geht der spät-jüd. Erzähler leicht hinweg.* The narrator, it may be supposed, knew more about Oriental manners and customs than did S; the author did not overlook this difficulty, but S overlooked אַחַר חֲצֵר. M did not talk to E; in c. 4 E sends Hatach to M, and M sends his answers through this eunuch. If M walked in the place before the forecourt of the royal harem, he could easily get some news concerning the inmates of the harem from the eunuchs. By some diplomatic questions he could even obtain some special information concerning E without revealing the fact that she was his cousin and foster-daughter. He could simply ask, How is that beautiful girl in whom Hegai takes so great an interest? See also n. on 6, 10.

* Cf. e. g. F. Marion Crawford's love story of Old Constantinople: *Arethusa, a Princess in Slavery*, and n. 42 to my lecture on *Ecclesiastes* in the *Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894). See also C 63, 3.

† M may have been an eunuch just as Nehemiah; see *Ezra* 67, 10 and *Pur.* 52, 15, also BL 118, l. 9. Cf. the conclusion of n. on 4, 8.

(12) For the striking similarity of the first clause of this verse (*cf.* also v. 15) and the statement in Herod. 3, 79 see *Pur.* 9, 2. *Cf.* also n. on 4, 13.

The שמן המר had an antiseptic effect, and purified the skin; the בשמים perfumed the body; the תמרוקים (*i.e.* lotions, rubbing, massage, &c) made the skin white and soft, and improved the figure.

(13) ובהדין זמן בחר means *and then* (Σ και τότε, Τ בחר) (דשליבין תרי עשר ירהין שתא) not *in this condition* (ס מהבא) although Wd thinks that it may have this meaning; ויבין (4, 16) on the other hand, means *and in this condition*, not *and then*. We find ויבין, and thus also in Eccl. 8, 10; *cf.* AJSL 22, 255, below; contrast GK²⁷, § 119, ii; GB¹⁴, 174^b. 316^b; BDB 486^b, 3. When one of the new inmates of the harem was sent to the King, she could get anything she required for this purpose, *e.g.* dresses, jewelry, &c. These things were, of course, not provided while she passed from the harem to the palace of the King (as S supposes) but before she left the harem; and when she came back from the King, she was probably obliged to return the jewelry &c to Shaashgaz or Hegai.

(14) ויני cannot mean *a second time* (B). It does not stand for שנית (*cf.* n. in Baer's edition, p. 72, below). Nor need we, with S, emend: השנית (= Σ^v τὸν δεύτερον) or משנה. ויני, *a second* (not *the second*) is a gloss (omitted in Σ) just as שנית in v. 19, and גם ביום השני in 7, 2, or השנית in 9, 29; *cf.* the שנית in Josh. 5, 2. The odalisques who had spent a night with the King were not transferred to another harem, as the glossator supposed; they returned to the same house, but they were henceforth under the care of another chamberlain (Σ^v, however, has Γαι = דגרי, not שעשגז). They were probably treated with special consideration, inasmuch as any one of them might become the mother of a royal prince.

The name שַׁעֲשֻׁגָז (Σ Susagazus, Σ ^ש ^ש ^ג ^ז) should be pronounced ša'-šē-gāz, not Sha'ashgaz; just as יַעֲמֹדוּ represents ia'-mē-dû, not ia'amdû. In the same way שַׁעֲמֵז, *linsel* should be pronounced ša'-tē-néz,* not ša'-at-nez (AJSL 22, 258).

Σ^v has Γαι (not שעשגז) also in the present verse; Σ^a Tε for Γε, see *Pur.* 42, 18; *cf.* φασγα for φαστα (9, 7). For Γαι = דגרי see nn. on v. 3. The gloss ויני presupposes the reading שעשגז.

(15) ויני אביחיל דוד מירדני אשר לקח לו לבת ויני is a subsequent addition (derived from v. 7 and from the gloss 9, 29) which severs

* According to TBAI 566 שַׁעֲמֵז should obviously be שַׁנְעִירִית, *a Shinarite woman*. On the preceding page Ch states that we must substitute for *Thou shalt not see the milk in his mother's milk* (Ex. 23, 19) *Thou shalt not clothe thyself with the garment of a Jerahmeelite woman*. Cf. Acts 26, 24.

the connection between **בהגיע תר אסתר** and **לבוא אל המלך**. If the author had intended to give the name of E's father, he would have mentioned it in v. 7. **ט**^v calls E again (cf. nn. on 7) **θυγάτηρ Αμειναδαβ ἀδελφοῦ πατρὸς Μαρδοχαίου**. **ט** **Αμειναδαβ** = **עמינדב**; cf. Cant. 6, 12 where **ט**^v has **ἔθετό με ἄρματα Αμειναδαβ** for **עמינדב ברכבות**. For **שמינתי** we must read **שמינתי**, *ye have placed me*; **עמינדב** means *kinsmen of a noble man*; see AJSL 18, 214; BL 26, †. Both **אביחל** and **Αμειναδαβ** = **עמינדב** are fictitious names emphasizing the fact that E's father was a distinguished man, an **ابن الاكابر**; cf. the names **מחלון** and **פליון** in the Book of Ruth.

The fact that E did not ask for anything, but took only what Hegai suggested, does not show her wisdom and her modesty (B) but her superior beauty. S thinks this incident illustrates E's modesty; he adds, however, *zugleich machte ihre Schönheit allen weiteren Schmuck überflüssig* (similarly Wd).

מ **כריס המלך** seems to be scribal expansion, derived from v. 14.

For **נשאת** see *Kings* 119, 24; cf. VG 49, β.

(16) For **טיבת** (Babyl. **ṭebētu**, stem **טבע**)* see my *Assyr. E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887) p. 11; cf. ZDMG 61, 284, below. For the *tenth* month, *Tebeth*, **ט**^v has the *twelfth* month, *Adar*. In **ט**^s **δωδεκάτω** has subsequently been corrected to **δεκάτω**, and **Αδαρ** to **Τηβηθ**. **ס** substitutes **חנך** **אסתר** for **טיבת** (**ח** **א** = January, **א** **א** = December) just as **ס** uses **סיון** for **סיון** (8, 9).

For **מ** **למלכותו שבע בשנת שבע** **ס** has **سبعة اشهر**.

(18) For the scribal expansion **אסתר אסתר** **ס** reads **سكس** **سكس**.

מ **הנחה**, **ט**^v **ἄφεσις** (**ט**^l **ἀφέσις**) means neither *rest* (**ס** **נָסָה**, **ט** *requies*) nor *a day of rest, holiday* (B, S) nor *exemption from military service* (cf. **בְּשִׁלְחָה**, *discharge from the ranks, furlough*, Eccl. 8, 8, and Her. 3, 67) nor *remission of taxes* (**ט** **שבוק כרנא**; so W 16, below; cf. 24 and C 73, 6) but *release of prisoners* (Matt. 27, 15). Demetrius I (162-150 B.C.) promised to release all Jewish captives in his kingdom (1 M 10, 33). If **ט** **ἄφεσις** meant *remission of taxes*, it would be an Alexandrian adaptation, just as **ט** **ἐθρονίσθη** (1, 2). Remission of taxes at festive occasions was customary under the reign of the Ptolemies, but not in the Persian empire or in the Seleucid kingdom. The promises of Demetrius I (1 M 10, 25-45) were extravagant, and Jonathan and his people *gave no credit unto them*. *Ἀνεσις* (**φóρων**) would be more appropriate than **ἄφεσις**. Oriental kings are, as a rule, loath to relinquish any

* Cf. **ṭebētu**, *signet* = Heb. **טבעת**; see e.g. Moses Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 117.

taxes; nor would an Oriental monarch ever give 10,000 talents to his grand vizier (see *ad* 3, 11). Release of prisoners, even a general pardon, or amnesty, is less costly.* **א** **הַנְּחָה** is inf. abs. instead of the finite verb (GK²⁷, § 113, z) as in 2, 3; 6, 9: **וַנְּחֹךְ**; 3, 13: **נְשַׁלְוֶה**; 8, 8: **וַנְּחַתֹּם**; 9, 1: **וַנְּהַפֹּךְ**; 9, 16: **וַנְּחַדֹּג וְהַרְוֵג**; 9, 18: **וְנֹחַ** and **וַעֲשֶׂה**; cf. *Nah.* 25, below; 27, below, and contrast n. on **וַאֲבַד** (9, 6). The infinitives **הַנְּחָה**, **הַצִּלָּה** (4, 14) and **בִּקְשָׁה** (5, 3; 7, 3) are Aramaic rather than Hebrew. Cf. however Arab. **إِرادَة**, **إقامة** *irāda*, *iqāma*, &c.

Instead of the singular **מִשְׁאָת** (Wd, S: *Getreidespende*; cf. Jer. 40, 5) we must point **מִשְׁאָת**, *portions* (cf. **מִנֹּת**, 9, 19, 22) *i.e.* dishes from the royal table or *messes* (see *Pur.* 47, 11). The nouns **מִשְׁאָת**, **מִשְׁאָה** have often been mispointed in **א**; see *Nah.* 42. **א** *ac dona largitus est juxta magnificentiam principalem*; **א** **מִשְׁאָת** *מִשְׁאָת*. B says, **מִשְׁאָת** means according to Am. 5, 11; Jer. 40, 5 *gift of grain or food*. The rendering *gift of food* (**ἡ τῶν σίτων θεραπεία**, Xen. *Cyrop.* 8, 2, 7; cf. *ibid.* 3 and *Anab.* 1, 9, 25) is correct, but not *gift of grain* (*σιτοδοσία*). In Jer. 40, 5 **מִשְׁאָת** is preceded by the gloss **אֲרָהָה**, *portion, ration*.

A glossator who misunderstood **מִשְׁאָת** to mean *tribute* (cf. 2 Chr. 24, 6, 9)† added the gloss which we find in **א** at the beginning of c. 10, where it is connected neither with what precedes nor with what follows, just as we find at the end of the Book of Canticles two disconnected misplaced glosses, *viz.* 12, 13 (belonging to 2, 14) and 12, 14 (which belongs to 2, 17). See remarks on misplaced incorrect glosses in ZDMG 61, 297, l. 20; *Nah.* 43 (vv. 11, 6) and 41; also 30 (v. 4) and 25 (v. 11). Cf. nn. on 3, 7; 9, 16.

According to AoF 3, 26 the King levied the tax after he had repealed the decree to exterminate the Jews, because he wanted the money which H had promised to pay for the privilege of exterminating the Jews. AoF 3, 27 the statement **וְהַנְּחָה לַמְּדִינֹת עָשָׂה וַיִּתֵּן מִשְׁאָת כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ** is said to be meaningless; it is suggested that we should read instead of **לַמְּדִינֹת** the singular **לַמְּדִינָה**, referring to the capital, *i.e.* Seleucia; **מִשְׁאָת** (or **מִשָּׂא**) is supposed to be merely a variant of **מִס**, meaning *impost*; v. 18 is taken to be the introduction to 10, 1, which should therefore be transferred to c. 10, the elevation of E to the queen-ship being the final climax.—This is all gratuitous.

* Even in 1 M 10, 34; 13, 34 ἀφεσις does not mean *remission of taxes* (ἀρέλεια). Cf. 13, 39: ἀφίμεν δὲ ὑμῖν ἀγνοήματα καὶ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας and 10, 33 where ἀφίμεν is used of the release of prisoners; cf. however vv. 29–31.

† The terms **מִשְׁאָת**, **מִנְחָה**, **מִדָּה** = Assyr. mandattu (for mandantu, from nadānu, *to give* = **נָתַן**, SFG 43, 2) are euphemisms; cf. AJSL 23, 231, n. 27; *Pur.* 47, 31.

(19) VV. 19 f. is not an *ἐπάνοδος* or *retrogressio*, as Grotius says, but a gloss added by some one who deemed it necessary to explain the clause **וּבְהַקְבֵץ בְּחֹלֹת שְׁנִית וּמִרְדְּכִי יֵשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ**. \mathfrak{G}^v omits **שְׁנִית** and the final clause of the preceding verse, **וַיִּתֵּן מִשְׁאֵת כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ**; for **וּמִרְדְּכִי יֵשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ** \mathfrak{G}^v has $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\ \text{Μαρδοχαῖος}\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \alpha\iota\lambda\eta$, which means, according to W 18, below, *he had a high position at the royal court* (cf. 11, 3; 12, 5) but *θεραπεύειν* may mean also *to pay a visit* (cf. *θεραπεύειν τὰς θύρας τινός*) &c. It is not necessary to suppose that M had an official position at the royal court (cf. C 75, 8; contrast 135, below). He may have been a **שֶׁלֶחָנִי** or *τραπέζίτης*, i. e. he may have had a money-changer's table at the King's Gate, i. e. apparently (according to 4, 2. 6) the gateway* leading from the City to the Acropolis; cf. last n. on c. 3. The *King's Gate* of Susa, it may be supposed, corresponded in some respects to the *Propylæa* of Athens. But according to \mathfrak{T}^2 (259, 27) the gate was between the royal palace and the harem (**וְעֵשָׂה כֵּן לְמִרְדְּכִי הַיְּהוּדִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ** (6, 10) in \mathfrak{G}^L *καὶ ποίησον Μαρδοχαίῳ τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι* is more correct than the rendering in \mathfrak{G}^v *οὕτως ποίησον τῷ Μ. τῷ Ἰ. τῷ θεραπεύοντι ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ*.

\mathfrak{M} **שְׁנִית** is a tertiary gloss; cf. nn. on **שְׁנִי**, v. 14, and 3, 7.

(20) This verse contains two tertiary glosses to **וְהָאִמֶּר אַחֲתֵר לְמֶלֶךְ בְּשֵׁם מִרְדְּכִי** at the end of v. 22 (cf. n. on 3, 7).

(21) \mathfrak{M} **מִשְׁמֵרֵי הַסֵּה** (\mathfrak{G}^v *οἱ ἀρχισωματοφύλακες*, \mathfrak{I} *janitores*, \mathfrak{S} **נִתְּנֵי זִכְרִי**) seems to be misplaced; it should be inserted in v. 22 (see below). According to 1, 10 (where **חֲרֵשׁ** has been displaced by the gloss **וְאַבְנֶתָא** Bigthan and Teresh were not **מִשְׁמֵרֵי הַסֵּה**, but belonged to the **שְׁבַע הַחַיִּים הַמְּשֻׁרְתִּים אֶת פְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ**. There is a difference between chamberlains and members of the body-guard.

Heb. **סָה** is a loanword = Babyl. *sippu*; for **סָה** instead of *sippu* cf. the remarks on **בַּת**, *daughter* = *bint* in nn. on v. 7.

According to AoF 3, 5 the discovery of the conspiracy is out of place in this connection; it should have been given in the beginning, as in \mathfrak{G} . This theory, however, is gratuitous. Cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on **אֶחָשֵׁרוּשׁ** (1, 1).

(22) \mathfrak{M} **וְהָאִמֶּר הַמֶּלֶכָה וְהָאִמֶּר אַחֲתֵר לְמֶלֶךְ בְּשֵׁם מִרְדְּכִי** cannot be the original reading, although the Ancient Versions have practically the same text: \mathfrak{G}^v *καὶ ἐδηλώθη Μαρδοχαίῳ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἐσήμανεν Εὐσθηρ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνεφάνισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς*. If we substitute for \mathfrak{M} **וְהָאִמֶּר הַמֶּלֶכָה וְהָאִמֶּר אַחֲתֵר לְמֶלֶךְ בְּשֵׁם מִרְדְּכִי** the name **לְהַמֵּן**, everything becomes perfectly natural and consistent; see *Pur*.

* Cf. the cut on p. 178 of the translation of Ezekiel in SBOT.

37, 20. We may add to להבין the statement הגאני from 3, 1 (see below) and בשמרי הסק (see *Pur.* 38, 5). How the received text originated I cannot tell. We have a similar confusion of names* in 7, 9 where 𐤄^{va} have Bovγathav (= בגתן; 𐤄^s Bovζathav = בזתן) instead of הרבוניה, and we find a similar transposition in 1 K 10, 1 where the clause לשם יהוה belongs to v. 25 of c. 9; see *Kings* 114, 36; cf. also the remarks on misplaced glosses in *Nah.* cited above, in nn. on v. 18 and the remarks on transpositions, *Nah.* 37.

(23) 𐤄 means they were impaled (see *Pur.* 6, 22) or crucified (B) not they were hanged (Reuss, Wd, S). Cf. Herod. 3, 159; also Josh. 8, 29; 10, 26. The King says in 7, 9: תלהו עליו, i. e. impale him upon it. Nor does הוקע mean to hang (see *Numbers* 59, 51). 𐤄 is true that 𐤄 means, as a rule, to be crucified† (especially in the NT; 𐤄 = 𐤄) but Assyrr. zuqqupu means to impale; cf. KAT², 378. 616. Gibbeting of the offender, or part of the offender, after death is in Assyrian ina gašiši alālu, to tie to a stake (AJSL 1, 230; HW 70^b. 207^b. 261^a, below). Greek σταυρός means not only cross, but denotes also the upright stake to which the delinquent was bound, when no tree was at hand, or on which he was impaled (see *Pur.* 6, 23).

In the clause 𐤄 לפני הדין inserts the negative: 𐤄 לפני הדין; cf. n. on v. 1. The negative is, of course, impossible (cf. 6, 2) but 𐤄 shows that the translator realized the difficulties in the received text.

𐤄 לפני הדין does not mean in the presence of the King, but to be presented (or submitted) to the King; at the disposal of the King (cf. Gen. 24, 51) or for the King, so that they might be נקראים לפני הדין (6, 1). The King had given orders to record all important events so that he might have an accurate account of all that had happened whenever he called for it. If extracts from newspapers are collected לפני הדין, the King does not superintend the clipping; nor does he read all the clippings. Similarly we find in the gloss 3, 7: הפיל הדין לפני הדין, i. e. the lot was cast for H; he had given orders that the lot be cast so that he might learn the result, but it is not necessary to suppose that H was present while the lot was cast; contrast *Pur.* 15, 5. Cf. also BL 117, below, and Mal. 3, 16; Is. 65, 6.

* Cf. also the confusion of names discussed in AJSL 23, 227, l. 6 and the confusion between H and M (see *Pur.* 3, 26) in S, referred to in n. on 7, 8. See also *Daniel* 29, 15; ZDMG 61, 294, l. 12; and Weissbach's article *Euphrates* in Pauly-Wissowa's encyclopædia, § 4 (according to Hesychius the Jews called the Euphrates Ἐδδκελ).

† Cf. also L, *Purim*, p. 9, below (صلب).

We must add at the end of c. 2 the statement והמלך לא ידע כי מירדכי הגיד להמין; see *Pur.* 37, 20–43. It is not necessary to say מירדכי הגיד את הדבר (*cf.* 3, 4; 4, 4; GK²⁷, § 117, f). Nor need we substitute מצא את הקשר (2 K 17, 4).

ג

(1) For the omission of המדתא האגני after המין in the present passage see *ad* 2, 22. \mathfrak{G}^v has simply Αμαν for המדתא האגני $\text{המין בן המדתא האגני}$ in v. 10; so, too, \mathfrak{G}^l . H represents the name of the principal deity of the Elamites (contrast n. on מירדכי, 2, 5) Humba, Humman, Amman, &c (see *Pur.* 10, 24). The double m of this ancient Elamite (or Susian) name is preserved in certain MSS of \mathfrak{G}^l (Αμμαν). Also the name of H's father (המדתא, \mathfrak{G}^l Ἀμαδάθος , \mathfrak{I} *Amadathus*) is not Persian, but connected with the name of the chief deity of the Elamites. The initial ה of המדתא is certainly not the article (LB *Medatha*) *cf.* \mathfrak{G}^v Γαι for הגי (see *ad* 2, 3). The u-vowel of Humman appears in Strabo's $\text{Ὠμανὸς καὶ Ἀνάδατος}$ (*Pur.* 26, 10). Rawlinson combined H with Ὠμάνης . \mathfrak{G}^A Αμαν in Tob. 14, 10 is a subsequent corruption or adaptation (*Pur.* 51, 5). \mathfrak{G}^v has there Αδαμ , \mathfrak{G}^s Ναδαβ . *Nadab* is given also in the *Vetus Latina*, while the Syriac Version has *Akab*; *cf.* EB 5112 and the various readings in Tob. 11, 18.

H is neither Persian nor Hebrew (*Pur.* 12, 16). In the apocryphal letter of the King (16, 10) $\text{Αμαν Ἀμαδάθου Μακηδών}$ (\mathfrak{G}^l δ *βουγάιος*) is called $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \tau\omega\upsilon \Pi\epsilon\rho\varsigma\omega\upsilon\upsilon \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (\mathfrak{G}^l *φρονήματος*) and in M's prayer (13, 12) H is called $\iota\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (*cf.* AJSL 23, 235, l. 6) but in the corresponding verse of \mathfrak{G}^l (5, 15 in L's edition) $\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$. He may have been an officer of the (colored) Susian body-guard of the Persian kings (*Pur.* 38, 5).

מִזְרַעִית אַגַּג (\mathfrak{S} 𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤅 , \mathfrak{I} *de stirpe or de progenie Agag, \mathfrak{T} *מִזְרַעִית אַגַּג*; *cf.* below) is a subsequent adaptation of the original הַגֵּאֵנִי , the *Gagean* or *northern barbarian*; see *Ezekiel* 99, 32. *Cf.* the remarks on δ *Μουχαῖος* = מִיְמוּכֵן (1, 14). In Num. 24, 7 (a Messianic passage added during the Greek period) all the Greek Versions have $\text{Γωγ} = \text{גַּג}$, instead of אַגַּג . In \mathfrak{G}^v the correct rendering of גַּג , Γωγάιος , which we find in some MSS (*Pur.* 42, 14) of \mathfrak{G}^l has been replaced by βουγάιος , which is not a *gentilicium* (*Βουγάιος*) but the Homeric term of reproach *βουγάιος* *braggart*, lit. *boasting like a bull*; see *Pur.* 13. H's contemporary prototype (*Pur.* 12, 3, 9) Nicanor (see *Nah.* 26) was a braggart; *cf.* 1 M 7, 34, 47 and the Talmudic passage Taanith 18^b (*Pur.* 5, 27) also the remark on $\iota\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in the preceding paragraph of the present n. In 5, 12 \mathfrak{G}^l has instead of \mathfrak{G}^v $\text{καὶ εἶπεν Ἀμαν, Οὐ κέκληκεν ἡ βασίλισσα κτλ.} : \text{— καὶ ἐκαυχᾶτο λέγων ὡς οὐδένα κέκληκεν ἡ βασίλισσα κτλ.}$*

Nicanor is a common Macedonian name. In 9, 24; 16, 10 טי substitutes δ Μακεδών for האגגי = האגגי. האגגי means *the Agagite*, i. e. *the descendant of Agag*, the king of the Amalekites (המין בר עמלק (המדתא די מזרעיתא אגג בר עמלק) who was spared by Saul, but hewn in pieces before יהוה at Gilgal by Samuel (1 S 15, 33) whereas M is introduced as a descendant of the first king of Israel (see *ad* 2, 6). Josephus, therefore, calls H an *Amalekite*; cf. L, *Purim* 50 and IN 389. The reading אגגי instead of האגגי must have been established in the first cent. B. C.

For Γωγαῖος = האגגי and Γωγ = גוג (גוג) Ez. 38, 2 cf. טוב = טוב (for ṭāiāb) *good*; אות = את (= āiat) *sign*; אחתי = Assyr. āti, iāti, Aram. יתי (see *Proverbs* 51, 7) *me*; post-Biblical נוד = נאד = נאד, Assyr. nādu (AJSL 20, 170) *skin-bottle*; דור = דאר, Δῶπα; רש = רש (Deut. 32, 32) = ראש = rāš, *poison*; פס = פס (Arab. كأس) *cup*; לא = לא, *not*; זאת = זאת, Eth. zātī; מאזנים, *balances*; מוסר = מוסר, *fetter*; מל = מל = מל = Assyr. mālu = ma'alu (stem מל; see *Pur.* 17, 1) *front*; צאן = צאן, Aram. עאן, *flocks*; ראש = rāš, rā'sh, *head*; סאן, i. e. סון for סאן, סאן, Eth. ṣān; ṣān, Assyr. šēnu, *shoe*; see *ad* 1, 5.

For Wn's untenable combination of אגגי (= האגגי) with Assyr. agāgu and Arab. حجاج ḥajjāj, *tyrant* see *Pur.* 42, 21.

From the Greek point of view the Macedonians were northern barbarians, and the Jews regarded the Samaritans as northern barbarians. This explains why H is called both a *Macedonian* and a *Gagean*; it also throws some light on the epithet of John Hyrcanus (cf. W 36, below). This Maccabean prince conquered the Samaritans and destroyed the temple on Mt. Gerizim in 128 B. C. Hyrcanus may mean *Conqueror of the Hyrcanians*, i. e. *Samaritans*; cf. *Scipio Africanus*, &c.* The Samaritans, it may be supposed, were called *Hyrcanians* owing to the admixture of foreign colonists from the North (cf. מושך in ψ 120, 5).† In the Talmud the Samaritans are called *Cutheans* (כותים) i. e. inhabitants of Cutha, NE of Babylon. H corresponds, in some respects, to Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem; see *Pur.* 52, 16.

(2) For the meaning of כרע cf. JAOS 22, 73.

*The founder of the dynasty of Reuss, Henry I, was called *Ruzze*, *Reusse*, or *Ruthene* owing to his exploits against the Poles or Western Russians about 1247; cf. Resch, *Über den Ursprung des dynastischen Namens Reuss* (Gera, 1874). The *Gymnasium illustre* at Gera is known as *Ruthencum*. Cf. the title of the Czar: *Selbstherrscher aller Reussen*, *French autocrate de toutes les Russies* (i. e. Great Russia, Little Russia, White Russia, &c.).

†Similarly the Greeks used *Hyperboreans* as a general name for the inhabitants of northern countries, and the Hungarians are often called *Huns*; contrast THCO 162.

אֵל לוֹ means *concerning him*; עֲלוּהוּ. H received this high rank כֹּהֵן; see *ad* 1, 15.

(4) The Kethiv בְּאֵמָרֵם (בְּנִלְלוֹתָהוּן ט) is better than the Q^{re} כְּאֵמָרֵם. The Q^{re} would mean *as soon as they said* (cf. כְּשֶׁךְ, 2, 1; כִּרְאוֹת, 5, 2. 9) but בְּאֵמָרֵם means *in (spite of) their saying*; cf. בְּכָל זֹאת, &c. For ב = כ cf. n. on וְכָדִי, 1, 16.

אֵל כִּי הִגִּיד אֲשֶׁר הוּא יְהוּדִי is an erroneous explanatory gloss to דְּבָרֵי מִרְדֵּכַי which does not mean *the words of Mordecai* (as in 4, 9) but *the attitude of Mordecai*; cf. n. on דְּבַר הַמַּלְכָּה, 1, 17. For incorrect glosses cf. *Nah.* 41, 1. 3; 43, 1. 7; ZDMG 61, 297, n. 115. אֵל הִיעָמְדוֹ דְּבָרֵי מִרְדֵּכַי is equivalent to *whether M would persist in his attitude* (3 *utrum perseveraret in sententia*; LB *ob solches Thun Mordechais bestehen würde*). M's Jewish extraction was probably unmis-takable so that it was unnecessary for him to tell any one that he was a Jew. He was known as מִרְדֵּכַי הַיְּהוּדִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ (cf. 6, 10 and n. on 2, 19).* E, on the other hand, may have been an Oriental beauty without any pronounced Jewish features so that she was able to conceal her extraction (cf. n. on 2, 10). The fact that M was a Jew would be no satisfactory explanation for his refusal to prostrate himself before H. The ancient Israelites did not object to the προσκύνησις; cf. e. g. 2 S 14, 4; 18, 28; 1 K 1, 16. The reason for M's refusal to bow before H was different (see *Pur.* 37, 40; cf. n. on 7, 6). Similarly M's ancestor, Shimei, of the family of Saul, refused to bow before David, and threw stones at him, although the King was surrounded by his body-guard; and the King did not punish him, just as H disdains to punish M, fearing, perhaps, that M's services in connection with the discovery of the conspiracy against the King would become known, if he tried to punish M (see *Pur.* 12, 40). If H succeeded in obtaining permission for a general massacre of all the Jews (cf. AJSL 23, 225, n. 4) the killing of M would attract no attention (cf. also C 93, 21). Certain Russian officials would adopt the same course in the 20th century; see *Pur.* 35, 9; 43, 18. 27. 32. 46; 44, 1.

(6) The clauses כִּי הִגִּידוּ לוֹ אֵת עִם מִרְדֵּכַי, after לָבְדּוּ, and אֵת כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים, at the end of this verse, are glosses to עִם מִרְדֵּכַי; cf. second n. on v. 4. Both glosses are omitted in G^v which reads for v. 6 of אֵל simply: καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο ἀφανίσαι πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀρταξέρξου βασιλείαν Ἰουδαίους = *בְּנִלְכוֹת אֲשֶׁר כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר יִבְקֵשׁ לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶת כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר יִבְקֵשׁ לְהַשְׁמִיד*. It is certainly unnecessary to read עִם מִרְדֵּכַי instead of עִם מִ.

*A Schnorrrer is said to have introduced himself to a distinguished Jewish banker of Berlin, stating, *Mein Name ist Hirsch*, whereupon the banker replied, *Das seh' ich*. See the cut representing Jewish captives in Assyria on p. 206 of Wellhausen's translation of the Psalms in the Polychrome Bible.

(7) V. 7 is a misplaced* later addition (to **בשלושה עשר להדש** in v. 13) introducing a subsequent popular etymology of **פורים**, which is just as fanciful as the Biblical explanations of **בבל**, **נח**, **פסח**, **אשה**, &c or the interpretation of **מנא מנא** in Dan. 5, 26-28; see *Pur.* 2, 37; 15, 21; 18, 17; SFG 25, below; BAL 99, n. 1. Also the second passage in E (9, 25) where **פור** is explained to mean *lot* is a subsequent addition.

The emendation of Grotius and Fritzsche, *κλήρων* instead of *ὑμῶν* in the apocryphal addition 16, 22, is very doubtful; it is not probable that the characteristic *κλήρων* should have been corrupted to *ὑμῶν* (cf. the remarks on the emendations *ὀργῆς* for *αἰλῆς* in 7, 4; **הנכם** for **נח** in 9, 16; **רכב** for **רנש** in nn. on 8, 10; also AJSL 22, 197, l. 15 and *Nah.* 26, below). *Ἐν ταῖς ἐπωνύμοις ὑμῶν ἑορταῖς* is generally interpreted to mean *among the feasts named after yourselves* (i.e. according to C. J. Ball,† *among your own Persian festivals or as if the word Purim were connected with the word Persians*) but *ἐπώνυμοι ἑορταί* may refer to the days on which the *ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος* was appointed (cf. *ἐνιαυτὸς ἐπώνυμος* &c). This institution existed among the Assyrians and Babylonians. The cuneiform term for *eponymy* is *līmu*; see HW 379^b; cf. the Lists of Eponyms in KB 1, 204-214; also AoF 3, 10. 12; KAT³, 331 (l. 9) and 518; OLZ 10, 332; see also Delitzsch, *Mehr Licht* (Leipzig, 1907) p. 9.

According to a tradition recorded by Berṭuni Purim may be the day on which the offices were assigned (**اليوم الذي يتقلد فيه الاعمال**) and Purim (**البورى**)‡ is said to mean *allotting* (**مساهمة**) or *distribution by lot*; see ZDMG 61, 275. Assy. *karāru ša pūri* (*Pur.* 20, below) seems to mean *to set up the urn* (*καδίσκος*) holding the lots to be drawn for the various offices, and this cuneiform *pūru* (HW 169^b: *būru*) *urn* (*κάλπυς*) may be connected with Heb. **פָּרוּר**, *pot*, lit. *boiler* (a form **פָּרוּר** of **פָּרוּר** and **פָּרוּר**, *glowing hotness* (see *Nah.* 43; cf. the remarks on **قارورة**, **فقير**, **وقيرة**, AJSL 23, 245. 244) also with **פורר**, *wine-press*, originally *vāt*; cf. the cut in the translation of *Joshua* (SBOT) p. 68 and my translation of Is. 63, 1-6 in JHUC, No. 163, p. 49^a. According to J. D. Michaelis Nicanor's Day might have been called **פורים**, because the Syrian army was crushed at Adasa as grapes are pressed in a wine-vat; see *Pur.* 51, 38.

* Cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on 2, 18 and the misplaced glosses in 2, 19. 20, also the gloss **ונויה מאיביהם** in 9, 16.

† See the *Variorum Apocrypha*, London (Eyre & Spottiswoode).

‡ The original form of this word is not **פורים**, but **פורר** for **פורר** = Ved. *pārti*, *portion*; see n. on 9, 26.

For פורה, *wine-vat* cf. also Hag. 2, 15. 16 where we must read:—

15 ועתה שימירנא לבבכם מן-היום הזה ומעלה
משרם שום-אבן 'על-אבן בהיכל' מ'י' הי'תם?
16 בא אל-ערמת עשרים והנה' היתה עשרה
בא⁸ לחשק המשים מ'פורה והיתה עשרים:

אל היקב 16 (β)

יהוה 15 (α)

For מ'י, *how?* cf. מ'י את בתי (Ruth 3, 16) and Assyr. *mi-nu*, *how?* (see n. on ב'אן, 1, 12). For ב'א, in the second couplet, read ב'א (cf. Hag. 1, 9). The omission of הנה in the second hemistich of v. 16 is due to the omission of הנה in the last hemistich; contrast לכבוש (1, 9) where the prefixed ל is emphatic; cf. n. on לכוש (7, 8). The omission of the prefixed מ' before פורה is due to haplography; for the *enjambement** in the last line cf. AJSL 23, 240 and the second line of Nah. 2, 11 (Nah. 50).

The plural of פורים may have been פורים (Pur. 20, 24; 51, 26) and הפיל פור הוא הגורל in the present verse is rendered in J: *missa est sors in urnam quae Hebraice dicitur phur*. The translation of הפיל פור הוא הגורל in G 9, 24, ἔθετο ψήφισμα καὶ κλήρον, means *he cast a ballot, that is a lot*, καὶ in this connection is explicative and corrective (cf. n. on 1, 17). For G's translation of הפיל פור הוא הגורל in the present passage see below, n. on הפיל.

There is no Persian word for *lot* from which גורל = פור could be derived; Pers. بېر, باره, پاره, بهره do not mean *lot* (see Pur. 45, 42) nor could they appear in Heb. as פור. The Iranian word for *lot* is پشک pišk. There may have been a word פור (connected with פורר, *pot* and פורה, *vat*) = Assyr. pûru, *urn*; but if פורים was combined with פור, *urn* it was merely a subsequent popular etymology which may have been suggested to a glossator by the use of מִנֶּה, *part, portion* in the sense of *lot, destiny*† as well as by the oracular practices observed on New Year's eve (Pur. 17, 38; 18, 27; 21, 33; cf. also C 101, 8) and the allotting of offices at the beginning of the year (AoF 3, 10).

Lostage (Days of the Lots) is the Ger. term for days on which it is possible to forecast the future (Pur. 18, 28). At the Chinese New Year's

* Contrast Budde's *Geschichte der althebr. Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 26, l. 8.

† According to Glaser (OLZ 9, 320) Heb. ב'ר (see Kings 163, n. *) may mean *part, portion, lot, oracle* (cf. Pur. 45, 3). As to אפור, Glaser thinks, it is not a *loin-cloth* = فوطه fôṭa or مقطب maṭṭab (see the translation of the Psalms in SBOT, p. 224, fig. s) but a *band or scarf* like the *stole* worn by Roman Catholic priests, or the *pall* of the Pope, archbishops, &c, and the טלית of the Jews. Cf. the Byzantine ὠμοφόριον.

festival the priest produces a box with small ivory chips variously inscribed. If the lot marked *wisdom* comes out, it means more wisdom for the man for whom the lot is drawn. Similar oracular practices may have prevailed at the celebration of the Persian New Year (Naurôz) in the times of the Maccabees. Cf. the statement of Berûni, quoted in ZDMG 61, 277, on the same day (Naurôz = Purim) the happy lots are distributed among the people of the earth (وَفِيهِ تَقْسِمُ السَّعَادَاتِ (أهل الأرض). The casting of the lots for the two goats on the Day of Atonement* may be a purified form of some Babyl. oracular practice at the beginning at the second half of the year (*Pur.* 3, 39; 4, 2. 20. 26. 33; 33, 14; 49, 26).

E is a festal legend for Nicanor's Day, just as the Book of Nahum is a festal liturgy for the celebration of that great victory gained by Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor on the 13th of Adar, 161 B. C. (OLZ 10, 64; ZDMG 61, 275). This commemoration of Nicanor's Day was combined with the observation of the Persian New Year's festival (celebrated at the time of the vernal equinox) which is no doubt based on the Babyl. New Year's festival (*Pur.* 3, 3; 4, 39; 11, 27; 19, 10). In the Talmud the cuneiform name of the New Year's Festival, akitu, aqitu† appears as אֶקִּיטָא (which is an adaptation of אֶקִּיטָא) while Naurôz is corrupted to מוֹהֲרֵין (for מוֹהֲרֵין, מוֹהֲרֵין). See ZDMG 61, 276.

The original meaning of פֻּרִים (= Naurôz = Akitu) is not *lots*, but *portions*, Heb. מִנֹּחַ; see n. on 9, 26.

In casting lots in order to determine what day would be most unlucky for the Jews and therefore most auspicious for the general massacre planned by H (*cf.* L, *Purim*, p. 8, l. 13) they did not try every single day of the year until they finally hit on the 13th day of the 12th month. They might have put 12 lots, marked from 1 to 12, into the urn (Assyr. pûru) and 30 lots marked from 1 to 30; then it was only necessary to draw two lots. But the phrase מִיּוֹם לְיוֹם וּמִחֹדֶשׁ לְחֹדֶשׁ shows that this simple procedure was not used at that time. They tried first the first day, then the second, and so forth; when the lot decided in favor of the 13th day, they tried to determine the month. In this way it was necessary to cast the lot 25 times before they hit on the 13th day of the 12th month. Cf. my remarks on *Urim* and *Thummim* in JBL 19,

*For the reason why the Day of Atonement was observed during the Babylonian Captivity on the 1st of Tishri, while the New Year was to be celebrated on the 10th of Tishri, see conclusion of n. on 9, 31.

†In the new texts found during the German excavations at Kal'at Shergât (Aššur) Assy. akitu appears as a synonym of kirêtu = כִּרְה (2 K 6, 23) and قִירָן qîran (see *Kings* 203, 15; MDOG, No. 33, p. 34; cf. the photograph of the bit akîti, *ibid.* p. 30). This shows that the etymology of akitu, given in *Pur.* 31, 3, is correct. Akitu appears in the Talmud as אֶקִּיטָא, while קִרָּא appears in Assyrian as כִּרָּא; cf. VG 122, also the remarks on קִרָּא = kîru (BL 132) and טַפְסָר = tupšarru in *Nah.* 34, and AJSL 23, 246.

73, n. 61 and *Numbers* 57, 41. *Adar* means *λυγαῖος* in Assyrian; the 13th of *Adar* was a *dies ater* κατ' ἐξοχήν (*Pur.* 32, 33).

הפיל is impersonal; so Keil, Schultz, R in K, S; LB *ward das Loos geworfen vor H*; cf. the translation in *℔*, quoted above, *missa est sors*, and the translation of *Leviticus* (SBOT) p. 62, l. 54; see also *Kings* 289, 19 and nn. on ויעש העץ (5, 14) and ויכתב &c (8, 10). It is not necessary to read, with O, הפילו; contrast 6, 9 where O reads והלביש instead of והלבישו. According to B, הפיל refers to H, and the explanation of פור is not merely הוא הגורל, as in 9, 24, but הוא הפני המן. הגורל לפני המן. הפיל פור (הוא הגורל) לפני המן:—הפיל פור. Even if we read הוא הגורל instead of לפני המן, as Wd suggests, the phrase הוא הגורל לפני המן would be very strange. For לפני המן see n. on לפני המלך (2, 23). According to *℥*² the lots were cast by the scribe Shimshai (cf. *Ezra* 4, 8. 17. 23 and C 103). *℥*² also states (*ad* 6, 1) that the King commanded the scribe Shimshai to bring the Book of Records. *℔* has אפיל מילתא הוא עדבא קדם המן; *℥* *أفيل قضا سوت قضا سوت*; *℥* (Syr. *فيل* is apparently a transposition of *ψηφος*; see *Pur.* 45, 11). For the translation of this clause in *℥*^v and *℥*^a see *Pur.* 16, 1. *℥*^u has και βάλλει κλήρους εἰς τὴν τρισκαιδεκάτην τοῦ μηνὸς *Adar* Νισαν κτλ. Here *Νισαν* represents a variant (cf. last n. on 1, 4) to *Adar* (it may be derived from *℔* ניסן at the beginning of this verse).

After *℔* מחדש we must, with B, R in K, Wd, following *℥* και ἔβαλεν κλήρους ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας καὶ μῆνα ἐκ μηνὸς (ὥστε ἀπολέσαι τὸ γένος Μαρδοχαίου) καὶ ἔπescen ὁ κλήρος εἰς τὴν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην τοῦ μηνὸς ὃς ἐστιν *Adar*, insert ויפל הגורל על שלשה עשר. The Heb. scribe skipped this clause owing to the repetition of the word לחדש. Keil, Rawlinson, Schultz regard this *plus* of *℥* as an interpolation from v. 13; nor has S inserted it in his translation. The clause ὥστε ἀπολέσαι τὸ γένος Μαρδοχαίου (which I have enclosed in parentheses) seems to be a subsequent addition in *℥*, which we need not insert in the Heb. text. O, however, prefixes אחר ביום מרדכי בית מרדכי ביום אחר ויפל הגורל to לאבד את בית מרדכי ביום אחר על יום שלשה עשר לחדש.

In the same way, the *fourteenth* day, given in *℥*^v, may be a subsequent correction for the *thirteenth* day (so *℥*^u; see above). In 8, 12; 9, 1 *℥*^v has the *thirteenth* just as *℔*. In the apocryphal additions *℥* has the *fourteenth* day in 13, 6; but the *thirteenth* in 16, 20 (*Pur.* 15, 11). Cf. also n. on 9, 17.

(8) For יִשְׁנֶה we must point יִשְׁנֶה; see *Numbers* 57, 36; cf. ZA 14, 347.

For מִפְּדֵר וּמִתְפַּרֵּשׁ (*℥* مِبْدَرٌ وَمِتْفَرِشٌ, *℔* مِبْدَرٌ وَمِتْفَرِشٌ) *℥* has simply διεσπαρμένον, but it would be a mistake to suppose that one of these

participles in **א** was due to scribal expansion. **ע** repeatedly substitutes one verb for two or three verbs of **א**; cf. n. on v. 13.

For **עם ודתייהם שנות מכל עם** cf. the *comparatio decurtata* (GK²⁷, § 133, e).

(9) The conjecture (AoF 3, 26) that **לאבדם** is a gloss, and that we should read **לשקול** (as in 4, 7) instead of **אשקול**, is not good; **יפתב ושקול** is not Heb. What Wn has in mind would be:—**יפתב וישקלו היהודיים עשרת כפר כסף**. But the suggestion that **הכסף** in v. 11 is a gloss is correct; see below and cf. above, *ad* 2, 18. The interpretation (W 17) that H offers the King 10,000 talents to make up the financial loss involved in the extermination of the people (loss of taxes) is unwarranted; cf. below, *ad* 7, 4.

Heb. **שקל** *to pay*, properly *to weigh*, may be a Babyl. loanword; cf. KAT³, 649. The stem is a Šaphel of **קל**; cf. n. on **ספר** (1, 22). The initial **ש** is therefore a **ש** (SFG 20, 3; ZDMG 34, 861; BAL 100; contrast AG², § 63) = **ש**, **ס**. For the **ל** in **לשקל** and the **נ** in **נשקל** cf. **פאשור** = Assy. paššûru = Sum. banšur (BA 1, 161) and **אשור** = Assy. Aššûr; **עשתי** = Ištar, &c; see my paper on the name *Istar* in JAOS 28, 118, below.

א **עשרי מלאכה** (cf. 9, 3) means here *officials*, especially *revenue officers* (cf. the remarks on **الأعمال**, ZDMG 61, 275). Also in 1 K 11, 28; 2 K 12, 12 (contrast *Kings* 240, 20) as well as in Neh. 13, 10; Ezr. 3, 9 &c **עשה מלאכה** means *business man* (cf. § 107, 23) especially *financier, tax-gatherer, collector*, &c. Cf. also 1 S 8, 16; Dan. 8, 27; 1 Chr. 29, 6.

(10) For **ציר היהודים** **ע** has **במיעקא דיהודאי**, **ܡܝܥܟܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐܝ**. The addition **בן המדחא האגני ציר היהודים**, which is omitted in **ע**^{VL}, seems to be a scribal expansion; see n. on v. 1.

(11) In **העם נתון לך והעם וגו'** the two words **הכסף** and **העם** should exchange places (cf. n. on 1, 6) and **הכסף** should be relegated to the margin (*Pur.* 6, 33) as the question of a reader who was anxious to know what became of the enormous amount of money (10,000 talents, i. e. about \$18,000,000). Cf. for this gloss *Kings* 137, 35; *Isaiah* 19, β; 81, 18; *Ecc.* 20, χ; 21, ε; 25, κκ; BL 3, γ. The King takes it for granted that H will pay the money into the royal treasury; he therefore deems it unnecessary to refer to it, saying simply: **העם נתון לך**. It is extremely unlikely that an Oriental monarch should be so generous as to turn over eighteen million dollars to his prime minister; cf. n. on 2, 18.

(12) For the Pers. loanword **אחשדרפנים**, *satraps* (**στρατηγοί**, **ܐܚܫܕܪܦܢܝܝܐ**, **ܐܚܫܕܪܦܢܝܝܐ** = *στρατηλάτης*) see n. on **אחשורש** (1, 1) also n. on **אחשתרנים** (8, 10).

Heb. פָּחָה is a Babyl. loanword. The singular פָּחָה must be pronounced pēxxāh (GK²⁷, § 27, q) not pēxāh (AOG 25).⁷ The doubling of the ח, however, is secondary, just as in אֶחָד, brothers; אֶחָד, one; אַחֵר, after, &c. In Assy. paxātu, pixātu (HW 519^b) the guttural is not doubled.

אֶחָד שָׂרֵי עַם refers to the native chiefs; שָׂרֵי עַם חֲמֵשׁ, רִבְבֵי ט, עֲמָא וְעֲמָא.

(13) Heb. רִצָּצִים, רִצָּצִים, רִצָּצִים, רִצָּצִים, רִצָּצִים (βιβλιαφόροι) means originally runners, then especially foot-soldiers; see Kings 232, 34. Here it is used for couriers (ἄγγαροι, cf. Her. 8, 98) who were (according to 8, 10) mounted. εἰς χεῖρας τρεχόντων ἰππέων (var. ἰππων) is a doublet; cf. Ἐλ Αἰδᾶν Νισαν in 3, 7 and n. on 1, 17. In Assyrian, rakbu (= רִכְבּ) is used for envoy, and allaku xanṭu for courier (HW 619^b, 281^b). The stem xamātu, to burn is identical with the stem xamātu, to hasten; the original meaning is to flash; cf. ZDMG 61, 297, n. 115 and modern Arab. رمح = رمح, رمح; also Nah. 41 (puridu, courier = برید).

לְהַשְׁמִיד לְהַרְגַּ וּלְאַבֵּד (so, too, 7, 4; 8, 11) is not pleonastic; לְהַשְׁמִיד, to exterminate is the general term (cf. v. 6 and 4, 18). This extermination could be effected either by a general massacre (לְהַרְגַּ) or by forcing the surviving Jews to flee from the country like wild beasts; cf. Arab. توحش = ابد and my remarks on the last line of ψ 1 in AJSL 19, 141, below. See also n. on וּלְאַבֵּד (9, 6) and C 121, below. At the time of the Syrian persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors the orthodox Jews were either massacred (1 M 1, 57. 63; 2, 38; cf. Pur. 35, 6 and n. on לְאַבֵּד, 4, 7) or forced to flee (1 M 2, 28. 29. 43; cf. Pur. 34, 39). εἰς ἀφανίσαι for לְהַשְׁמִיד לְהַרְגַּ וּלְאַבֵּד, just as מִדְּרָכִי לֹא כָרַע וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (v. 2) is rendered ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος οὐ προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, or as we find for מִפְּזֹר וּמִפֶּזֶר (v. 8) simply διεσπαρμένον. For the accumulation of synonyms, which is by no means indicative of a late date, cf. ZDMG 61, 295, n. 97.

Heb. שָׁלַל, to plunder (cf. 8, 11) is a Babyl. loanword. The noun שָׁלָל (שָׁלָל; cf. AJSL 3, 107) means here household effects, personal property, just as Ger. Plunder means household effects, trumpery, baggage, while the verb plündern means to pillage. In certain parts of the United States the term plunder does not mean pillage, spoil, booty, but household or personal effects, baggage, luggage. Ger. plündern is a privative denominative like our to skin &c (AJSL 22, 251; Nah. 32). Assy. šalālu (HW 662^b) means to carry off; so שָׁלָל denotes movables; French meubles; cf. the Ger. privative denominative vermöbeln. See also Pur. 34, 18.

*S has שָׁלָל also for סָרִיס in 6, 14.

their garments at the breast for a hand's breadth and put on the loin-cloth under their ordinary garments (*Kings* 210, 7).

(4) The K^{ethiv} תְּבוּאֵינָה (Q^{ere} תְּבוּאָנָה) is based on the analogy of the verbs לָהֵךְ and לָאֵךְ; cf. תִּגְלִינָה, תִּמְצִינָה, and סְבוּתָה which is based on the analogy of the verbs לָוֵךְ (see n. in the paper on the name *Istar* in *JAOS* 28, 113).

וַתַּחֲלֹחַל הַמַּלְכָּה מְאֹד (AV *then was the queen exceedingly grieved*) means *the Queen was very much shocked*. The use of הַמַּלְכָּה instead of אֶסְתֵּר is intentional, just as the omission of הַמַּלְכָּה in 1, 19 is designed. M was stripped of all clothing save the coarse loin-cloth.* This was distasteful to the Queen (cf. 2 S 6, 20). She therefore tried to induce M to put on the garments she sent him. 5^v has ἐταράχθη for וַתַּחֲלֹחַל; in 7, 6 5^{VL} ἐταράχθη is used for נִבְעָה, and at the end of c 3 5^v has ἐταράσσεται for נִבְוִכָה. 3 renders *consternata est*. The stem וַתַּחֲלֹחַל is derived from חָלָה, just as הִשְׁתַּקְשַׁק (for הִתְשַׁקְשַׁק) is derived from שָׁקַק; see *Nah.* 41.

The verb קָבַל (ס 𐤒𐤁𐤋, 𐤒𐤁𐤋𐤀 קביל) is Aramaic; cf. the glosses in 9, 23, 27 and n. on וְאֵלַי (7, 4). Assyr. qablu, *midst* (BL 97) = Arab. qalb, *heart* (AJSL 1, 227); cf. last n. on 7, 9.

(5) For הִתְךָ (ס 𐤇𐤒 with 𐤒 misread 𐤒) has Ἀχραθαῖος. This is a transposition of Ἀθαχαῖος, the ρ emphasizing the guttural (velar) character of the 𐤒; see BA 1, 257, l. 18. For ὁ Ἀχραθαῖος (v. 9) cf. n. on ὁ Μουχαῖος (1, 14) and for the transposition cf. the remarks on Αγαθας = Γαβουθας = Βουγαθας in nn. on 1, 10. Ἀχραθαῖος may be influenced by Greek names like Ἀχάρης, Ἀχράδης, &c.

וַתֵּצַק הַעֲבִיד (3 *quem rex ministrum ei dederat*, AV *whom he had appointed to attend* † upon her) just as הִקְרַב in 2, 14; it could also be intransitive (ס 𐤇𐤒𐤁𐤀). Cf. AJSL 22, 204, l. 5; *Psalms* 83, 50.

For אֵל read אֵל, as in v. 10 (ס 𐤀𐤋). Cf. עַל גִּנְדִּי (v. 7) for אֵל גִּנְדִּי and nn. on 1, 17. The phrase צֹוֶה עַל, which means *to enjoin upon*, is correct in vv. 8, 17 and in 2, 10; צֹוֶה אֵל means *to order to, to order to go to*. This is a *constructio praeagnans* (GK²⁷, § 119, ee) like אֵל . . . קָם (7, 7).

(7) The translation (AoF 3, 26) *M told him everything, and the amount of money which H had commanded to pay to the Jews‡ in order to annihilate them; he gave him also the tenor of the edict which he had issued in Susa in order to exterminate them*, is impossible.

* Cf. the fifth footnote to nn. on 3, 7.

† Cf. n. on וַתֵּצַק (5, 1).

‡ German (?) *welchen H befohlen hatte zu bezahlen den Juden sie zu vernichten*. Wn means, I suppose, *welchen H den Juden zu bezahlen befohlen hatte*, i. e. *which H had commanded the Jews to pay*.

Heb. לשקול ביהודיים cannot mean *to pay to the Jews*;* ב is the ב pretii (see Kings 224, 5) פ pro Judæorum nece. In his nn. S explains the ב as ב pretii (so, too, Wd; cf. n. on 7, 4) stating that ביהודיים means properly *als Preis für die Juden*, but in his translation he renders *in Betreff der Juden*. There are several discrepancies between the translation and the nn. in S's commentary, which would, perhaps, have been eliminated, if S had been able to revise his work; cf. nn. on 1, 20; 5, 1. 8; 6, 6; 7, 8; 8, 11; 9, 2. 16. 26; also S's transliteration Mordehai (as though it were מרדכי) and Pur. 29, 26.

For the Kethiv ביהודיים the Qerê substitutes the contracted form ביהודים; cf. 8, 1. 7. 13; 9, 15. 18.

ואבדם means here *to ruin them*; this includes killing and proscription, banishment, expulsion with confiscation of property (cf. n. on 3, 13).

(8) The Athnaḥ in ולהגיד לה is correct; ולהגיד לה must not be connected with the following ולצוות עליה (against B). The inf. ולהגיד is coordinated to the preceding להראות: Hatach is to show E the document and to tell her about it, explain it to her (AV *to show it unto E and declare it unto her*). Hatach told the Queen the substance of the edict, although he presented a copy of the decree. Even if E could read the copy, she was probably satisfied with the verbal report. An official who submits a letter to his superior will often give the substance of it, so that the letter is not read, although it is produced. The clause ולצוות עליה represents the final request: M requests Hatach to urge E, in view of all the evidence submitted, to go to the King. The eunuch Hatach may have been a Jew; cf. C 145 and the second footnote to n. on 2, 10.

(11) For the etymology of פנימית cf. AJSL 22, 258, below.

For אהת דתו, *there is but one decree for him*, cf. Dan. 2, 9: חדא דתכון. The suffix in דתו represents the *genitivus objectivus* (so S): *his decree = the decree against him*; contrast n. on 1, 17. The loanword דת is feminine; cf. 3, 8. 15 (דתיהם שנות) and SG², p. 57, below.

The ל in להמית (ט) להמית דיניה לממת (ט) may be the *Lamed inscriptionis*, as in Is. 8, 1 (GK²⁷, § 119, u). This is a variety of the emphatic ל (cf. n. on לכבד, 7, 8) just as Assy. mā before the *oratio directa* is a variety of the emphatic ma (see Proverbs 68, 7). ע^v renders אהת דתו להמית freely: οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ σωτηρία, פ *absque ulla cunctatione statim interficiatur*; LB *der soll stracks Gebot sterben*.

Baer reads שרביט, with Raphéh; but שרביט = Assy. šabbîṭu, so the r is merely resolution of the doubling (VG, § 90) as in Assy.

* Nor can ביהודים... אמר לשקול mean *he commanded the Jews to pay*.

kursû (cf. Aram. כורסא, Arab. كرسى) = kussû (Heb. כסא) throne (Sumer. guza) or דִּמְשִׁיק = דִּמְשִׁק (Assyr. Dimašqu). Consequently the כ should have a *Dagesh lene*; the *Raphélh* may be disregarded, just as in לָהּ for לֶה (Ruth 2, 14). For Masoretic endorsements of manifest textual errors see *Kings* 288, 19; 298, 12. Cf. also אֲבֶרֶן (8, 6) instead of אֲבֶרֶן.

AV *these thirty days* = זֶה שְׁלִשִּׁים יוֹם (note Gen. 31, 38: AV *this twenty years* = זֶה עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה) is a Hebraism. It means lit. *This is thirty days*, i. e. *for the past thirty days*; cf. French *il y a* and GB¹⁴, 174^b, b; BDB 261^b, i.

(12) For וַיִּגְדֹּר read וַיִּגְדֹּר (scil. Hatach) following Buhlin Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, or וַיִּגְדֹּר (GK²⁷, § 121, a).

(13) For this third message of M to his foster-daughter in the royal harem cf. Otanes' third message to his daughter Phædymia (Herod. 3, 69: τριτὴν δὲ ἀγγελίην ἐσπέμπει). See *Pur.* 8, 34; cf. also C 64. 145. 149 and n. on 2, 12.

אֵל בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ is haplography for בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ (see nn. on 1, 9). It cannot be appositive to תְּדַבֵּר, *als dem Königshause angehörig* (S).

For מִן, *alone of, singled out* in מִכָּל הַיְּהוּדִים cf. Ruth 1, 5: וּתְשָׂאֵר הָאִשָּׁה מִשְׁנֵי יְלֵדֶיהָ.

(14) אֵל כִּי does not mean *vielmehr* (S) but *for*; כִּי must be connected, not with the following conditional (or concessive) clause introduced by אִם, but with תֵּאבְדוּ אֶבֶךָ תֵּאבְדוּ. The author might have said: — כִּי (אִם הָחֵרַשׁ תַּחֲרִישִׁי בַּעַת הַזֹּאת) אֶת וּבֵית אֶבֶךָ; תֵּאבְדוּ וְרוּחַ וְהַצֵּלָה יַעֲמֹד לַיְּהוּדִים מִמָּקוֹם אַחֵר; but the received text is no doubt original.

For רָחָ read רָחָ; also לְרוּחַ הַיּוֹם (Gen. 3, 8) must be pointed לְרוּחַ הַיּוֹם; see *Nah.* 33, ad 17^b.

The *scriptio plena* יַעֲמֹד may be due to dittography of the ך; see *Nah.* 19 (ad v. 6) and the remarks on אֶחָשִׁירֶשׁ for אֶחָשִׁירֶשׁ (1, 1). אֵל יַעֲמֹד means *wird erstehen* (Keil, K) not *wird bestehen* (B). The meaning is not, *the deliverance is established* and certain, but *it will arise*, turn up. וְרוּחָ וְשִׁזְבוּתָא יָקוֹם לַיְּהוּדָאִי מִן אַחֵר אַוּחָרָן, ὡς αὐτὸν βοήθεια καὶ σκέπη ἔσται τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ὅ ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ἔσται αὐτοῖς βοηθὸς καὶ σωτηρία, ἢ *per aliam occasionem liberabuntur Judæi*.

אֵל מִמָּקוֹם אַחֵר does not refer to *help from abroad* (1 M 8, 17; 12, 1) as S supposes. Even in the 20th century it is hardly possible for the Jews in Russia to get any help from abroad, e. g. the United States or England. *From another place* or *from some other quarter* is a veiled allusion to God. The avoidance of the name of God is certainly not

accidental (N) but intentional (Wd). According to N (EB 1403) it is due to the coarse and worldly spirit of the author; but the avoidance of the name of God is no evidence of coarseness or worldliness: a man may be absolutely irreligious, yet use the name of God in an oath &c. The phrase *הַצִּלָּה יַעֲמֹד מִמָּקוֹם אֲחֵר* is a reverential allusion to intervention on the part of the Supreme Being, just as some one may say in Washington, The Secretary of State is in favor of it, but Somebody Else may object, alluding to the President.* In post-Biblical Hebrew, *הַמָּקוֹם* is used of God (cf. JBL 24, 17) and *אֱלֹהִים* is substituted for *אֱלֹהִים*, just as we prefer to say *By Jove*, or *dear me*, or *Good gracious*, *Good by*, &c in order to avoid the name of God. Ger. *achherrnje* is a corruption of *Ach Herr Jesus*, just as *Hullee gee* is a corruption of *Holy Jesus*.

מִי יוֹדֵעַ אִם לַעֲת כְּזֹאת הִנֵּחַת מַלְכוּת means, *Who knows whether thou hast not attained royalty for a time like this*, i. e. *Perhaps thou hast been made Queen just for such a contingency*; cf. Gen. 45, 7; 50, 20. *καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐβασίλευσας*; so, too, *Ἔτι quis novit utrum idcirco ad regnum veneris, ut in tali tempore paraveris?* *מִי יוֹדֵעַ אִם מַלְכוּתָא וְכֵן אֶמְלִיכָא סְלִיכָא לְחַבְּרָא*, ומֵאֵן הוּא הִכְמִיָּא דִּי יִנְדַּע אֵין לְשִׁתָּא דִּאֲתִיָּא בְּעִידָנָא הֲדָא אַח *אח* מִשְׁיָא לְמַחֲסָן מַלְכוּתָא. Instead of the rhetorical question *Who knows?* Ethiopic uses a negative expression for *perhaps*, viz. *ኢየሱአ*: *ēndā'ī*, lit. *not my knowing*, *haud scio*, *אִינֵנִי יוֹדֵעַ*; see Dillmann's grammar (1899) p. 343; English translation by J. A. Crichton (London, 1907) p. 387. For similarly clipped forms cf. my remarks on the causative prefix *ש* in nn. on 3, 9 and in the paper on the name *Istar* (JAOS 28, 114) also *Nah.* 24, below: VG § 44, d; and the remarks on *מִיָּדָר* (5, 8).

מִי יוֹדֵעַ אִם means *perhaps*, just as Lat. *haud scio an*; contrast *haud scio an non*=*perhaps not*. As soon as the negative is inserted (after *art*) in AV *Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this*, the meaning is clear. LB, correctly, *Wer weiss, ob du nicht um dieser Zeit willen zum Königreich gekommen bist*; C *und wer weiss, ob du nicht (grade) für diese Zeit zum Königreich gelangt bist*. Similarly AV renders Jon. 3, 9: *Who can tell if God will turn and repent* instead of *Who can tell whether God will not turn and repent*. If we substitute *but* for *אם*, we need not insert the negative.

*In the German *Reichstag* Gen. Von Deimling, the commander of the colonial troops in German Southwestern Africa, said on May 26, 1906: *Darüber haben Sie hier nicht zu bestimmen, sondern ein Anderer* (i. e. the Emperor). In his novel *Tristram of Blent* (vol. 1, p. 255 of the Tauchnitz edition) Anthony Hope says: *And if by a miracle he [the prime minister] said yes, for all I know somebody else might say no. This dark reference to the Highest Quarters caused Southend to nod thoughtfully.*—Ibid. p. 270 we find: *There was now not only the very grave question whether Robert Disney [the prime minister]—to say nothing of Somebody Else—would entertain the idea; and on p. 117 of vol. 2: The last words had, presumably, reference to the same quarter that Lady Evenswood had once described by the words "Somebody Else."*

If the negative were inserted in Hebrew, 'אם לא לעת וגו', the phrase would mean: *Perhaps thou hast not been made Queen just for a contingency like the present.* This statement would be possible only if E had not become Queen. If the King had given orders to kill the Queen, the father of one of the maidens who were not made Queen, might have said to his daughter: — מי יודע אם לא הגעת למלכות . לעת כזאת . The negative in our *Who knows whether thou hast not been made Queen just for such an emergency* is on a par with our *not* in phrases like *Won't you come?* which is quite different from *Will you (really) not come?* The particles הלא or מידוע (B) could not be used in this connection. B's interpretation (which has been adopted by Reuss) *Who knows (what may happen) when thou hast come to the royal throne at that time or when thou hast appeared before the King's majesty at that time* (Ger. *Und wer weiss wenn du um diese Zeit hingekommen sein wirst zum königlichen Thron*) is impossible. This would be: ומי יודע מה יהיה כבואך אל המלך בעת ההיא . The words מה יהיה could not be omitted, and בעת ההיא would be appropriate only if a time had been specified; e. g. if E had been urged to go to the King at a certain time, then some friend, wishing to dissuade her, might say, *If I were you, I would not go; who knows what will happen when thou goest to the King at that time.* It is true that this phrase might also anticipate a favorable outcome; Naomi might have added to her instructions in Ruth 3, 3: ומי יודע מה יהיה כבואך אל האיש בעת ההיא, but without מה יהיה the statement would be meaningless.

(16) מן עלי means *for me* (3 *pro me*; see conclusion of n. on ובכי) cf. על עמה (v. 8) and על נפשו (7, 7) also על נפשם (8, 11).

For לילה ויום see *Kings* 104, 32.

In גם אני ונעתי אצום the conjunction ו means *with*; in Arabic, , in such cases is construed with the accusative (WdG 2, 325, D; JAOS 22, 108, n. 5). Cf. יבוא המלך והמך (5, 4).

מן כן, thus means, *not for the same period, i. e. for three days* (B) but *in the same (strict) manner, viz. day and night.* Fasting was observed, as a rule, from sunrise to sunset, food and drink being taken each day after sundown, just as in the Mohammedan fast of Ramadan (رمضان).

For ובכן, and so (so, correctly, AV; but ὅτι καὶ τότε, 3 *et tunc*, S ובתר כן cf. Syr. ܐܬܝܬܐ = ܐܬܝܬܐ see n. on 2, 13 (the ב is not the *essentia*, as B and Wd suppose; cf. n. on 7, 3). This statement expresses E's confidence in God's help. After having fasted for three days, both day and night, she could not be very attractive to the King, unless God wrought a miracle as in the case of Daniel and his friends (Dan. 1, 15). The fasting in the present case is not a sign of mourning,

but humiliation before JHWH in order to secure His help; cf. 2 S 12, 22; 1 K 21, 27; Jon. 3, 5. Post-Biblical תַּעֲנִית, *humbling*, means *fast*; cf. עָנָה נַפְשִׁי and nn. on the translation of Leviticus (SBOT) p. 82, l. 40. אֵל has for צוֹמֵר עָלַי (so, too, §) *orate pro me*, and אֵל adds to וְצוֹמֵר עָלַי:—עֲלֵמָא.

It is not necessary to suppose that the verb אָבַד in the phrase אֵל כְּאִשֶּׁר אֲבָדְתִּי אֲבָדְתִּי (cf. Gen. 43, 14 and GK²⁷, § 106, n) means *to be banished* (see n. on אָבַד, 3, 13). E risks her life, just as Sheherazade and the Herodotean prototype of both, Φαιδρμένη (*Pur.* 8, 38). אֵל *tradens-que me morti et periculo*.

(17) אֵל דִּיעֲבַר does not mean *he transgressed* the Law by ordering a fast for the 13th and 14th of Nisan (so J. D. Michaelis) but *he went over* (so C 162) to the City to call the Jews of Susa together and to urge them to fast for three days in order to crave JHWH's blessing on E and her hazardous undertaking in behalf of her brethren. The City, in which M's brethren lived, was separated from the Acropolis (cf. n. on 1, 2) by the Choaspes, Assy. Uknû (JHUC, No. 114, p. 111^b; cf. JAOS 18, 145, n. 1).

ה

(1) It is perhaps not necessary to insert (with B, R, Wd) לְבוּשׁ before מַלְכוּת (AV, put on *her* royal *apparel*) as in 6, 8; 8, 15. ^vπεριεβάλετο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς, but ^bπ. τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης, אֵל *induta est regalibus vestimentis*, § ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ, אֵל *לבשת לבושי מלכותא*. The abstract מַלְכוּת may mean *regalia*. Milton uses *royalty* for *emblems of royalty* (Assyr. simat šarrûti). LB *zog sich königlich an*; so, too, C 163. S translates: *da zog E das Königs'gewand' an*; but in his nn. he states that לבש מלכות לבש is abridged for לבשת מלכות; cf. nn. on v. 8 and 4, 7.

אֵל דִּיעָמַד does not mean *she stepped in, entered* (S) or *she stood* (so AV = אֵל *stetit*) but *she waited*; cf. 6, 5; 7, 7 and our *stay* = Lat. *stare*, Arab. أَقَامَ (*Kings* 174, 27; cf. n. on העמיד, 4, 5). *To stay* means *to come to a stand, stop, wait, remain*. Shakespeare says: *a servant that stays upon me*; cf. העמיד לפניה (4, 5) also עָמַד in Eccl. 1, 4; Ex. 9, 28 (עָמַד לַעֲפֹן וְלֹא אַחֲכֵם) and Josh. 3, 16 (וַיַּעֲמִדוּ) הַמַּיִם; cf. Ger. *stauen*).

אֵל נָכַח פֶּתַח הַבַּיִת does not refer to E (as S states) but to the royal throne; נָכַח בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ refers to E, but not נָכַח הַבַּיִת. The throne was opposite the entrance, so that the King, seated on his throne, could see who was waiting in the forecourt.

(2) אֵל עֲמִידָה is a circumstantial accusative; see *Kings* 136, 37; 298, 3; and below, vv. 9. 14: שׁוֹמֵחַ; v. 13: יוֹשֵׁב; 6, 12: רֹאשׁ. אֵל. Cf. also Gen. 27, 6: הִנֵּה שְׁמַעְתִּי אֶת אֲבִיךָ מְדַבֵּר אֵל עֹשֶׂה אַחֲרָי;

Is. 6, 1: וַאֲרָאָהָ אֶת אֲדֹנִי יֹשֵׁב עַל כִּסֵּא רִם וְנִשְׂאָ; Is. 6, 8: וַאֲשַׁמְעֵנִי אֶת קוֹל אֲדֹנִי אֹמֵר.

The rendering of וְתַבֵּעַ in *ἢ osculata est* is unwarranted; *אֶסְפֵּן*, *אֶחֱדִית*.

(3) The מִה in בְּקִשְׁתָּךְ; וּמִה is indefinite (GK²⁷, § 137, c) = *what(ever) thy request, even* (if it should be) *half the kingdom, it shall be granted to thee*. *מִה בְּקִשְׁתָּךְ* means, not *מִמֶּנִּי מִכֶּסֶּד*, but *מִכֶּסֶּד מִמֶּנִּי* or *מִכֶּסֶּד מִלְּפָנַי*. The *וּ* in וּיִכְתֵּן (*ἔν καὶ ἔσται σοι*) is the *Waw apodosis*; cf. n. on וְכָרִי (1, 17). S supplies before this *וּ*:—(*was du auch verlangst*). *ἔν* inserts in the present verse before *καὶ ποιήσω σοι*:—*ἀνάγγελόν μοι*; and in v. 6, before *ἕως ἡμῖνος τῆς βασιλείας μου*:—*αἰτησάι* (cf. Mark 6, 22: *αἰτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι*). *ἢ etiam si dimidiam partem regni petieris, dabitur tibi*; *אֶפִּילֹו אַם אַנְתּ בַּעִיָּא לְפַלְגוּת מַלְכוּתִי*; *אֶחֱדִית לָךְ*; S *מִכֶּסֶּד מִמֶּנִּי מִכֶּסֶּד* disregards the *Waw apodosis*; so, too, LB *auch die Hälfte des Königthums soll dir gegeben werden* and AV *it shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom*.

(4) *מִלֹּךְ* is preferable to *לְכֹוֹן*; contrast *לָהֶם* (v. 8). For *וְהַמֶּן* see n. on *וְנַעֲרָתִי* (4, 16).

(5) The view (AoF 3, 36) that 5, 5-8 is merely an erroneous repetition of 7, 1 is gratuitous.

(6) *שְׁאַלְתָּךְ* must be read *שָׁלַחְתָּךְ*; see last n. on 2, 15.

(7) The ; at the end of this verse corresponds to our —. There should be a dash, not a colon in K's *Textbibel*; also the *Athnaḥ* in *בְּקִשְׁתָּי* (v. 8) is equivalent to a dash. E starts to tell the King what her petition and request is. She begins: *My petition and request*—then she hesitates and decides to wait another day; she therefore invites the King to dine with her a second time when she will answer his question (so, correctly, B and Wd). The idea, that it would be better to wait another day, comes to her while she adds the humble qualification: if the King is kindly disposed toward me, and if it seem proper to the King to grant my petition and to accede to my request.

(8) The last clause of v. 8, *וּמִחֵר אַעֲשֶׂה כְּדַבֵּר הַמֶּלֶךְ*, shows that the explanation given above is the correct interpretation of vv. 7, 8. If this last clause were omitted, we might interpret: *My request is* (= all I ask is simply) *that the King dine with me again*. S supplies in his translation after my request:—*besteht darin*, following *ἢ petitio mea et preces sunt istae* (just as LB and AV supply *is* at the end of v. 7) but in the nn. he gives the correct explanation; cf. n. on 4, 7.

מִדְּהָר (*مَدَّهَر*) is generally read *mōḥḥār* and supposed to be a

contraction of ^ימֵאָחֶר,* the part. Pual of אָחֶר; but the initial ^י is a remnant of יוֹם, *day*, just as the final ם in שְׁלִשּׁוֹם, *the day before yesterday*, lit. *the third day*; cf. the remarks on אָחֶר: in nn. on 4, 14. The adverb מֵאָחֶר is shortened from יוֹם אָחֶר or יוֹמֵאָחֶר, for יוֹם אָחֶר, יוֹם אָחֶר; cf. Heb. יוֹם אַחֲרָיו (Prov. 31, 25; Is. 30, 8). For the long *â* cf. אָחֶר = אֲחֵר + ם. The original meaning is *posterior day, subsequent day, following day*; contrast Fürst's dictionary (edited by R) 1, 724^a. The form מֵאָחֶר (constr. מֵאָחֶר) must be a compound of אָחֶר + יוֹם; the fem. form מֵאָחֶר may be a contraction of אָחֶרֶת; cf. אֲחֵרֶת, at last and מֵאָחֶר, at first (SG², § 155) also פֶּרֶת (= פָּרִית pāraiat, ZDMG 61, 194, n. 2) Gen. 49, 22; see Genesis 111, 35 and GK²⁷, § 80, g.

(9) In קָם וּלֹא זָע the two verbal forms are participles in the accusative (קָם) not perfect forms. It is not necessary to say וְהוּא לֹא קָם וּלֹא זָע; see Kings 136, 38 and cf. n. on עֲמִידָה (v. 2). [ⓔ] καὶ μὴ προσκυνεῖ με, but [ⓔ] סָבַח מֶלֶךְ כְּסֵל עֲלֵי מַלְאָכָיו (in 4, 4 [ⓔ] has מַלְאָכָיו = וְתַחֲלִהֵל). Nor does זָע וּלֹא mean *er machte nicht Platz* (S). [ⓔ] sed nec motum quidem de loco sessionis suae; LB noch sich vor ihm bewegte; AV nor moved for him. In [ⓔ] we find the correction: καὶ οὐκ ἐξανάστει οὐδὲ ἐτρόμυσεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

(10) For זָרֶשׁ ([ⓔ] זָרֶשׁ, [ⓔ] Zares) [ⓔ] read Ζωσάρα (Vet. Lat. Zosarra) and [ⓔ]: Ζωσάρα, i. e. זָרֶשׁ; for the ω cf. [ⓔ] Ζωσάρα = בְּנִתָּא (1, 10). The form Ζωσάρα is probably influenced by the Greek name Ζωσάριον. Josephus reads Ζαράσα (with variants). Jensen conjectured that זָרֶשׁ was a corruption of גִּרִּי = Qiri(ri)ša, the name of an Elamite goddess; cf. וְשִׁתִּי (1, 9) and for גִּ = רִ: Ezekiel 114, 31 and [ⓔ] Αβαραζα = אַבְנִתָּא, [ⓔ] Ζηβαθαθα = בְּנִתָּא; see nn. on 1, 10. For Babyl. [ⓔ] = ק see VG § 45, t (cf. *ibid.* b, β). Jensen is now inclined to identify זָרֶשׁ with the Babyl. goddess of wine, Sirešu (see Genesis 81, 34; Pur. 30, 34; 31, 25) just as he accepts Graetz's (or rather J. D. Michaelis') combination of פִּוּרִים and פִּוּרָה (see Pur. 50, 2; cf. n. on 3, 7) but his former explanation is preferable. According to [ⓔ], זָרֶשׁ was זָרֶשׁ, בֵּית תַּחֲנִי פָתַח עֲבָרָה, זָרֶשׁ was זָרֶשׁ, חֲתָנִי וְשִׁתִּי cf. n. on חֲרָר (1, 6). Ch thinks (EB 5411) that זָרֶשׁ is a mutilated form of צִרְפַּת; cf. Ch's explanation of וְשִׁתִּי (1, 9).

(11) Hitzig's conjecture רֵב פִּנּוּי, *die Fülle seines Ansehns* (cf. جليل) = *his great distinction* (endorsed by B) is just as gratuitous (contrast פִּרְשִׁים for בְּרִשִׁים, Nah. 2, 4) as his emendation וּמִדְּבַר כָּל שְׁוָה, *et filiorumque turbam*, [ⓔ] = אֲבָנִים, [ⓔ] = אֲבָנִים (cf. 9, 10).

*In BDB 563^b מֵאָחֶר is connected with Assy. maxru, *front*; but *front* means *past*, and *back* = *future*; cf. SFG 15, n. 3.

Θ^v reads καὶ εἶπεν τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ εἰσφέρειν κτλ, but מ is more original. Θ τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ (cf. *Pur.* 7, 21) is just as secondary as the clause ὅτι θεὸς ζῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ at the end of v. 13, or καλῶς ἐλάλησας in v. 10, or καλέσατε αὐτὸν instead of יבוא (S 𐤒𐤕𐤍, T יענל, I *ingrediatur*) at the end of v. 5.

מ is דברי הימים (T דיומא (מילי) is a gloss (so, too, J) derived from 2, 23 and 10, 2; cf. n. on 8, 14 and the remarks on the gloss פוט, *Nah.* 31.

(2) Similarly מישמרי הקס is a scribal expansion based on the received text of 2, 21. Cf. the scribal expansions in 2, 3. 8.

(3) In מזה נעשה יקר וגדולה the two nouns are genitives depending on מזה (I *quid, pro hac fide, honoris ac praemii M consecutus est*). In the same way we find in the cuneiform account of the Deluge, l. 174: á'ú-ma ūḡi napišti, *what soul has escaped?* cf. Arab. *أي رجل* áiiu rájulin, *what man?* (WdG 2, 220). Consequently we must read the ideograms at the end of ll. 82, 83, and 68 of the Flood tablet as genitives (not accusatives, HW 556^b; nor nominatives, KB 6, 234) viz. mima išū eḡēnši xurāḡi, i. e. *I loaded her (the ship) with all the silver I had, I loaded her with all the gold I had; lit. (with) whatever I had I loaded her of gold; eḡēnši = aḡēnši from ḡēnu = צען. Heb. טען* (Gen. 45, 17) is an Aramaism; cf. פתרון in Gen. 40 (see *Nah.* 25, 2). The passages in Gen. 40, 45 belong to the Ephraimitic Document. AG², 303 translates eḡēnši: *I filled it; for the epenthesis of the ē in eḡēnši see my Assyri. E-vowel*, p. 28; cf. AG², 266. 94. In the same way we must read in l. 68 of the Flood tablet: III-šar ḡābe nāš sussulša iḡābilū šamni, i. e. *three σάρποι of (sesame-) oil (see Pur. 30, 39) carry her stevedores (lit. κανηφόροι, basket-bearers; cf. also Delitzsch, Mehr Licht, p. 39).*

(4) For בא לחצר read בא אליהצר; the omission of the א is due to haplography; see *Ezra* 30, 27; *Kings* 245, 35; ZDMG 61, 289, 40.

(5) For עמד (T קאים, S 𐤒𐤕𐤍) waiting (not standing, AV *stand-eth*) see n. on 5, 1.

(6) For לעשות מזה cf. n. on 1, 15.

מ does not mean *to confer more honor than on me* (B *mehr Ehre als mir*; also Wd *mehr als, AV more than to myself*) but *to confer honor except on me* (Θ^{vi} εἰ μὴ ἐμέ, I *nullum alium nisi*; LB *wem anders denn mir, K ausser*) S translates *ausser mir*, but in his nn. he says, יותר ממני means *mehr als ich*; cf. n. on 4, 7. מ יותר ממני (T יתיר מני, S 𐤒𐤕𐤍) means *beyond me, beside me, in addition to me*. Nor does מן יותר mean *more than* in Ecclesiastes, as Wd states. In Eccl. 2, 15 יתר means *exceedingly, extremely, very*; in 7, 11 it means *exceeding; superior, better*; in 7, 16: *exceeding, over, too*; in 12, 9: *beyond, in addition to*; in 12, 12: *besides* (see *Eccl.*).

(7) The prefixed nominative absolute, at the end of this verse, **איש אשר** **המלך הפץ ביקרו**, does not reflect the *verblendete Überstürzung* of H, as Wd supposes; this construction is by no means abrupt (B) in Semitic; cf. GK²⁷, § 143, c, footnote; WdG 2, 256; SG², § 317; Dillmann, Ethiop. gr.², p. 446 (Eng. translation, p. 505).

(8) For the phrase **די לבישו ביה ית** (**אשר לבש בו המלך**) **כל למלכותא**, but **מלכא ביומא די על למלכותא** (5, 11).

The last clause of this verse, **ואשר נתן כתר מלכות בראשו**, is a tertiary scribal expansion, derived (cf. n. on 8, 14) from the secondary addition in 8, 15 (**ועשרת זהב גדולה**) and **אשר** is a quaternary gloss. If we omit **אשר**, the suffix in **בראשו** refers to the man who is to be honored (just as the Maccabean prototype of M, Jonathan, was honored by King Alexander Balas; see 1 M 10, 20. 61; *Pur.* 6, 35; cf. also third n. on 9, 16) but **אשר נתן כתר מלכות בראשו** can mean only *on whose head* (referring to the horse) *a golden crown has been placed* (so **ודי איתיהב כלילא דמלכותא ברישיה** **אשר נתן** the suffix refers to the horse, the clause being coordinated to the preceding relative clause (**די רכב עלוי מלכא** **ביומא דעל למלכותא**). **אשר**, LB, and AV, however, do not refer the suffix to the horse: **אשר** (*et (homo debet) accipere regium diadema super caput suum*, LB (*den Mann . . . soll man herbringen*) *dass man die königliche Krone auf sein Haupt setze*, AV and the crown royal which is set upon his (scil. the King's) head (this would require transposition of **אשר נתן**—**מלכות**: **אשר נתן בראשו**). **אשר** was inserted by a reader to whom the **כתר מלכות** on the head of M seemed too gross an exaggeration; cf. n. on the gloss **ימים רבים** (1, 4). If the final clause, **ונתן כתר מלכות בראשו**, were original, we should expect a reference to **מלכות** in v. 10, after **את הלבוש ואת הסוס**; also in v. 11. It is possible that this gloss **ונתן כתר מלכות בראשו** stood originally after **והלכשו ביקרו**. **אשר נתן** is, of course, perfect Nif'al, not impf. Qal (Maurer) for **נתן** (see *Judges* 57, 42). Nor is it necessary to read **ויתנו** or **וינתן** (B) for **ונתן**, especially if this gloss stood originally after **והלכשו וגו'**. In **א**^v this clause is omitted; in **א**^s a hand of the 7th cent. has added in the margin (after the clause **אשר נתן**) the correction *καὶ δοθήτω διάδημα βασιλείας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*.

(9) It is better to read, with O, for **והלכשו** (**וילכשו**) and **וקראו** (**וירכיבו**) the singular, **והלכש** and **וקרא**; in the same way **וירכיבוהו** (**וירכיבוהו**) should be pointed **וירכיבוהו**; cf. the singular forms in v. 11 and **א**^v *στολισάτω . . . ἀναβιβασάτω . . . κηρυσσέτω* (**א**^s *στολισά-*

τωσαν . . . κηρυσσέτωσαν are secondary). The incorrect plural forms והלבוש &c are due to the preceding הפרתמים. The author no doubt believed that M did not merely superintend these functions, but that he performed them himself; cf. especially ℥² (260, 23). The statement at the end of c. 5, ויעש העץ (cf. also אשר עשה המן and אשר הכין in 7, 9, 10) is somewhat different.

ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ (פתאה דקרתא ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ) is the *forum of the city* (Keil) not the place before the royal palace (Schultz, B, Wd). M was led on horseback through the City, not through the Acropolis; cf. last n. on c. 3. This forum may have been before the Acropolis which contained the royal palace, but not immediately before the royal palace.

(10) For ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ (ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ qui sedet ante fores palatii) see n. on 2, 19.

The question raised by J. D. Michaelis, *Had the King forgotten that all the Jews were doomed to destruction?* is easily answered. The King might have honored M, even if all the Jews were to be massacred in a few months; a soldier (or sailor) may be decorated before he is put to death. But the King had probably decided to discard H and his sanguinary policy, as soon as he learned from the official records that M had saved his life, not H. The order to honor M, which he gives to H, is the first instalment of the punishment he intends to mete out to H (cf. n. on 7, 7). Nor is it reasonable to ask, *How did the King know that M was a Jew at the King's Gate?* This was probably stated in the records; if not, the attendants of the King could easily supply this information, just as Harbonah told the King that H had put up a stake for M. If the King asked, *Who is this M?* some one was no doubt present who could answer: *He is a Jew* (who has a stand) *at the King's Gate*. But M may have been a familiar figure in Susa, so that he was known to the King. Cf. nn. on 2, 10, 11; 3, 14.*

(12) ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ (ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ, ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ, ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ) is corrected in ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ to κατακεκαλυμμένος κεφαλῇν. J's conjecture, that the original text was not ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ or ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ, but ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ, is destitute of all probability.

(13) The *Dagesh forte conjunctivum* (GK², § 20, k) ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ is due to the enclitic character of ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓ; cf. the Dagesh in ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ &c for ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲓⲉⲗⲓⲁⲓ (Cant. 73, ad Cant. 3, 2; Proverbs 67, 41) also Arab. لا يا ما qalilúmma; لا يا ما fi-kúlli-mā 'āmin; فاما الناس ما حاشا قريشا la'iámma, with great difficulty;

*I believe, of course, that E is entirely fictitious (see *Pur.* 21, 35). I merely try to defend the author of E against unwarranted criticisms of modern expositors (cf. e.g. nn. on 2, 10; 3, 14; 7, 7; 8, 11, 13; 9, 3) just as my paper on *Jonah's Whale* (cf. *AJSL* 23, 255) in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 46, pp. 151-164 (1907) is not a vindication of the historical character of this Sadducean apologue (about 100 B.C.) but a refutation of some unfounded objections raised by modern students of the Bible.

fa'ámmâ 'n-nâsu-mâ* hâšâ Quraišan (WdG 2, 224, D; 276, B; 343, B) &c. The *Dagesh orthophonikum* (GK²⁷, § 13, c) in תוכל-לִי (cf. 7, 3: אַם-מִצַּחֲתִי) is different. For enclitic words in Heb. see *Nah.* 19; cf. VG 70, below; 94, l. 4. Contrast ZAT 3, 17–31.

We need not suppose that H's wife and his friends were familiar with the Scriptural passages concerning the Amalekites (Ex. 17, 16; 1 S 15, 2–7; Gen. 32, 26, &c). A person who lived in Susa might have seen with his own eyes that it was hard to accomplish anything against a Jew. Cf. the parallels between E and the Book of Nehemiah referred to at the end of nn. on 3, 1.

(14) For the *Wav apodosis* in עוֹדֵם מִדְּבָרִים עִמּוֹ וְסָרִיסִי וְגַ' cf. Job 1, 16. 17. 18 (עוֹדֵם זֶה מִדְּבָרִי וְזֶה בָּא) and n. on כִּרִי (1, 17).

7

(2) For the gloss אֶחָד בְּיוֹמָא (ἓν τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ, ἓ) אֶחָד בְּיוֹמָא (חֲנִינָא) see n. on 2, 14.

(3) The preposition in בְּשִׂאלְתִּי (so, too, שְׁט) and בְּבִקְשִׁי is not the ב *essentiæ* (see *Numbers* 57, 46) as Wd supposes; nor have we the ב *essentiæ* in וּבִקְשִׁי (4, 16). מִאֲשִׁאלְתִּי means simply *at my request* (so AV) just as בְּדַבְרִי (1, 12) means *at the command*. This is a variety of the ב *instrumenti*; ב in this connection means *through the force of*; cf. our *in* or *by virtue of* and *by order* &c. Ἐν δοθῆτω ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ αἰτήματι μου; 3, freely, *dona mihi animam pro qua rogo*.

(4) מִאֲשִׁאלְתִּי (so, too, S) is Aramaic; cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on 1, 8.

The clause כִּי אֵין הָצָר שׁוּחַ בְּנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ means: *It is not worth while to annoy the King on account of the enemy* (so, too, Reuss).—The sense is correctly given by B (431, 13): *der Feind ist nicht werth, dass ich seinetwegen den König verletze oder betrübe*, except that *verletze* or *betrübe* is not the proper word; it should be *belästige*, *behellige* (see below). The literal translation would be: *The enemy is not equivalent to the annoyance of the King*. The ב in בְּנוֹק is the ב *pretii*: the enemy is no equivalent *at the cost of* the annoyance of the King; cf. Josh. 6, 26: בְּבִלְכֹּר יִסְדְּנָהּ וּבְצִעְרֹי יָצִיב דְּלִתְיָהּ, *he shall lay the foundation thereof at the cost of* (AV *in*) *his first-born*, and *at the cost of* (AV *in*) *his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it*; i. e. *The laying of the foundation shall cost him his first-born, the setting up of*

* Mā in such cases must be connected with the preceding word, not with the following حاشي. Also in حَيَّةٌ حَبِيشَةٌ مَا هِيَ hāiīatun xabīṭatun mā hiya, *a very dangerous snake* and similar cases (WdG 2, 276, D) mā emphasizes the preceding word; the original meaning is: *A snake—dangerous indeed she (or he)*. For the emphatic -ma in Assyrian see also Moses Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 60.

the gates shall cost him his youngest son (see the translation of this passage in the Polychrome Bible and cf. above, n. on 4, 7). To annoy the King would be too high a price for the punishment of this enemy; the enemy is so utterly worthless that it would be a pity to give the King the slightest annoyance on his account. This statement implies the greatest respect and consideration for the King, and the utmost contempt and hatred for H. \mathfrak{S}^2 renders correctly: אָרום לית בעיל דבביה. The noun טננא means not only *zeal*, but also *annoyance*; אֲזַיֵּץ means *to be provoked* (cf. Ger. *sich ereifern* and Heb. קנאה Deut. 29, 19; Ezek. 5, 13; ψ 79, 5).

The ἀπαξ λεγόμενον נזק does not mean *damage*, but *annoyance*. It corresponds to Arab. نَزَق nāziqa, *to be easily angered and easily pacified* (طاش وخف عند الغضب). The noun نَزَاة nazāqa means *a swell of sudden anger, a fit of disappointment or anger, a huff*. Also Assy. nazāqu (impf. izziq) means *to disturb, trouble, harass*. Barth's combination of נזק with نقص nāqqaqa, *to injure* is wrong (cf. BA 3, 81).

Dan. 6, 3, וּמִלֹכָא לֹא לְהוּא נִזְק, does not mean *that the King should have no damage*, but *that the King should not be annoyed, troubled* (with the administrative details of the government). Θ renders correctly: ὅπως ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ ἐνοχλῇται, *Et rex non sustineret molestiam*, LB und der König der Mühe überhoben wäre. Behrmann's rendering, *ne quis rex detrimenti capiat*, which is endorsed by Marti, is incorrect. \mathfrak{S} translates: סְמַלְחָא לָן נְהִי־סָא מְחַסְרָא, *that they (the satraps) should not annoy the King*; אֲרִי (הָרִיר) means not only *to do harm*, but also *to annoy, molest, irritate*.

In Ezr. 4, 13 מְלִכִּים חֶהְנוֹק means: *she (Jerusalem) will give the great King* (cf. ZDMG 61, 289, 17; Nah. 30, below) *trouble*. Jerusalem cannot injure the great King, but the city may give him trouble. The clause וּמִלִּכִּים חֶהְנוֹק certainly does not mean: *thou shalt endamage the revenue of the Kings* (AV). \mathfrak{S}^v has here καὶ τοῦτο βασιλεὺς κακοποιεῖ, *Et usque ad reges haec noxa perveniet*, \mathfrak{S} סֵף מִלִּכִּים מְחַסְרָא, LB und ihr Vornehmen wird den Königen Schaden bringen; but \mathfrak{S}^t reads 1 Esdr. 4, 13: καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις βασιλεῦσιν ὀχλήσουσιν (cf. end of next paragraph).

In Ezra 4, 15 מְהִנְזָקָת מְלִכִּין וּבְדִינִין means, not *hurtful* (AV) but *troublesome for the great King* (ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς) and *the provinces* (the satraps) and לְהִנְזָקָת מְלִכִּין, at the end of v. 22: *to the trouble (or annoyance) of the great King* (not *to the hurt of the kings*; so AV). מִן אַפְתָּם in Ezra 4, 13 is certainly not a noun meaning *revenue*, but an adverb with the meaning *eventually, finally, ultimately*. \mathfrak{S}^v has in Ezra

4, 15: *κακοποιούσα βασιλείς καὶ χώρας* (so, too, \mathfrak{G}^L 1 Esdr. 4, 15; but Ezra 4, 15: *βασιλεύει καὶ πόλεσιν ἐνοχλοῦσα*; so, too, \mathfrak{G}^V 1 Esdr. 2, 19) and at the end of v. 22: *εἰς κακοποιήσιν βασιλεύσιν*; but \mathfrak{G}^L has here *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐνοχλεῖσθαι βασιλείς*, and in 1 Esdr. 4, 22: *τοῦ ὀχλεῖσθαι βασιλείς*, cf. \mathfrak{G}^V 1 Esdr. 2, 24 *εἰς τὸ βασιλείς ἐνοχλῆσαι* (see below).

In the present passage \mathfrak{G}^V renders **כִּי אֵין הָצַר שְׁוֹה בְּנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ** :—*οὐ γὰρ ἄξιος ὁ διάβολος τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ βασιλέως*. J restores the Heb. text on the basis of this corrupt translation as follows: **כִּי אֵין הַשֹּׁטֶן שְׁוֹה בַּחֲצַר הַמֶּלֶךְ**. This may be archaic Hebrew, but even Saul would not have understood it without the help of the witch of En-dor (cf. n. on 8, 1). \mathfrak{G}^V *αὐλῆς* is also supposed to be a corruption of *ὄργῆς*, but it is difficult to see how *ὄργῆς* should have been corrupted to *αὐλῆς*; cf. the remarks on the emendation *κλήρων* for *ὑμῶν* in nn. on 3, 7. C 197 thinks that *αὐλῆς* represents a Grecized form of **עוֹלָא**, *injustice*. The original reading may have been the abbreviated genitive of *ὄχλησις*, *trouble*, *annoyance* (cf. *ὄχλον παρέχειν*, *to give trouble*, &c). \mathfrak{G}^L *καὶ ἤθελον ἀπαγγεῖλαι ἵνα μὴ λυπήσω τὸν κύριόν μου* gives the sense of the passage correctly, but freely. *I nunc autem hostis noster est cuius crudelitas redundat in regem* (i. e. whose extreme cruelty will reflect on the King) is a mere guess. LB *so würde der Feind dem Könige doch nicht schaden* is entirely wrong; nor is the rendering in K's *Textbibel* any better: *da aber der König geschädigt werden soll, so verdient der Widersacher nicht geschont zu werden*. In **שָׁוֶה חַסְדִּי וְנִי חֲסִידִי** the participle **שָׁוֶה** seems to be a corruption, not of **שָׁוֶה**, as B-R suggest, but of **שָׁוֶה**; S has **שָׁוֶה** = **שְׁוֹה** in 3, 8, but **שָׁוֶה** in 5, 13. **אֵרוֹם לִית מַעֲרָקָא** **שִׁמְיָן וְרוּחָא בְּאוֹנִיקָא דְּמִלְכָּא**. All these various renderings presuppose no different text. **אֵרוֹם לִית מַעֲרָקָא** seems to be a transposition of **אֵרוֹם לִית מַעֲרָקָא**; cf. conclusion of n. on **אַחֲשֵׁתֶרִים** (8, 10).

כִּי אֵין הָצַר שְׁוֹה בְּנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ is correct and means: *for the enemy is not worthy of troubling the King*, i. e. the enemy is so contemptible that it is not worth while to trouble the King on his account. All the emendations proposed are unnecessary. Oettli's conjecture, **כִּי אֵין הַצֵּלָה שְׁוֹה בְּנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ**, *salvation (from this destiny) is not worth the damage of the King* (endorsed by Wd) is gratuitous and illogical. Nor can we accept O's emendation **הָצַר שְׁוֹה** for **הָצַר שְׁוֹה** (S: *solches Bedrängniss wäre nicht hinreichend den König zu betrüben*). GB⁴, s. v. **שְׁוֹה** renders: *Der Feind verdient nicht, dass der König verletzt wird*; this should be *dass der König (seinetwegen) behelligt wird*.

The rendering of AV, *although the enemy could not countervail the King's damage*, has recently been defended by W who says (W 18) that

the meaning of our passage is, H would not be able to reimburse the King for the damage (loss of taxes &c) he would suffer, if he permitted H to exterminate the Jews. W 24 calls attention to the fact that there were a great many Jewish publicans in Egypt, and that the King (Euergetes II) would have suffered great loss, if the Jewish farmers of the revenues had been exterminated together with their coreligionists. But if the property of the Jews had been confiscated, the King would have received, not only all the taxes collected by the Jewish publicans (including their commission) but also their accumulated wealth; see also *Pur.* 28, 15.

(5) **מִי וְיֵאמֶר** 2° (so, too, **ט**) is superfluous. **ט**^v has simply *εἶπεν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τίς οὗτος κτλ.*

מִי הוּא זֶה וְאֵיזָה הוּא means *Who is it, and where is he?* (cf. **מִי זֶה וְעַל מִה זֶה** at the end of 4, 5). It is perfectly natural to say **מִי הוּא** in the first clause, and **אֵי זֶה הוּא** in the second: in the first clause, **הוּא** emphasizes the interrogative pronoun; in the second, **הוּא** is the subject and quite appropriate according to GK²⁷, § 136, b; **אֵי זֶה** means here *where?* not *which* (Eccl. 11, 6). The demonstrative **זֶה** emphasizes the interrogative **אֵי** in the second clause (contrast GB¹⁴, 24, below) just as **הוּא** emphasizes **מִי** in the first clause (see *Nah.* 47, ad v. 12). For **אֵי**, *where?* cf. Is. 50, 1; 66, 1; Job 28, 12, 20; 38, 19^b. Heb. **אָן** *where?* Ruth 2, 19 (=Assyr. ānu, Arab. أين aīna; see *Kings* 203, 9) is merely **אֵי** with the interrogative particle **אֵי**; which we have also in *mannu*, *who?* (see n. on 1, 12). **ט**^{vl} omit **וְאֵיזָה הוּא**, in **ט**^s a corrector has added *καὶ ποῖός ἐστιν οὗτος*, **ט** **הֵנָּה** **כֵּן** **אֵל** **אֵלֶּה**, **ט** **הוּא** **דִּין** **וּבְאֵי דִין** **אֵתֵר** **הוּא** **אֵל** **אֵלֶּה**.

מִי מִלְאָה לְבוֹ means *whose heart has filled him* (so AV^m) but not *welchen sein Herz erfüllt hat* (Wd) nor *der sein Herz damit erfüllt hat* (S) nor *dessen Herz ihn erfüllt hat* (B). Cf. the remarks on the common mistranslation of **אֲשֶׁר . . . שִׁלְחָה** in nn. on 5, 11. We must (with J) read **אֲשֶׁר מִלְאָה לְבוֹ**, *who has filled his heart*, i. e. *who has the audacity*, **ט**^{vl} *ἐτόλμησε*, **ט** *audeat*, **ט** **לִבִּי** **לִבִּי** **לִבִּי**, **ט** **אֲנִי** **לִבִּי** **לִבִּי**; cf. the Pharisaic gloss Eccl. 8, 11 and Acts 5, 3 where Peter says to Ananias: *δὲ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*. A man must fill his heart (i. e. his mind) with barefaced audacity in order to undertake such a venture; he must gather up courage in his heart.

(6) **מִי צַר וְאֵיזָה הוּא** does not mean *The adversary and enemy is this wicked H*, so AV; LB *der Feind und Widersacher ist dieser böse Haman* (similarly S and K). This would require the article, **הַצָּר וְהָאֵיזָה הוּא**; cf. GK²⁷, § 126, k; § 116, q. **ט**^v *ἀνθρῶπος ἐχθρὸς Ἀμαν ὁ πονηρὸς οὗτος*, omitting **צַר**; in **ט**^s a corrector has prefixed *ἐπίβουλος καὶ τὸ ἐχθρὸς*. **ט** *hostis est inimicus*

noster pessimus iste est Aman, inserting *noster*; § גַּבְרָא מְעִיקָא וּבִעִיל דְּבַבָּא דְּמִן בֵּישׁ הָדִין, תַּעֲלֵה סַם הַלָּא עִמָּא. B's *ein Drangsal übender und feindseliger Mann ist dieser böse H da* is very awkward. The first clause, אִישׁ צַר וְאוֹיֵב, represents the answer to the King's question מִי־הוּא זֶה, and the second clause, דְּהִנֵּן הִרַע הַזֶּה, answers the question וְאִי־זֶה הוּא (cf. n. on v. 5). The King asks, *Who is it? and where is he?* E replies: *A man, an adversary and an enemy: H, the evil one, there!* In L's edition (but not in Swete) we find the correct punctuation: ἀνθρῶπος ἐχθρὸς· Ἀμαν ὁ πονηρὸς οὗτος. C xx translates: *Ein Widersacher und Feind ist es; H ist dieser Bösewicht*, but C 198 explains: *Jener Übelthäter und Feind ist H, dieser Bösewicht*.

E had invited H to the banquet in order to be able to give the King this answer. If she had accused H in his absence, the grand vizier would have had a better chance to defend himself (cf. C 168). Here he was confronted with the Queen, and he collapsed, not because he had tried to exterminate all the Jews, but because he knew the King was aware of the fact that M, not H, had saved the King's life, and that H's hatred against M and the Jews was chiefly due to his apprehension lest the trick to which he owed his sudden elevation might become known to the King (cf. n. on 3, 4). The situation was all the more desperate after the Queen had told the King that she was a Jewess and the foster-daughter of M who had saved the life of the King.

אֵל נִבְעַת means *he was surprised, taken by surprise, overtaken* (Ger. *überrumpelt*) not *he was afraid* (so AV). Arab. بَغَتْ means *to happen unexpectedly, to come or fall upon a person suddenly and unexpectedly* (بَغَتْ إِذَا فَجَأَ). The noun بَغْتَةٌ denotes a *surprising event, a sudden attack*. ἑταπάχθη, which is used in 4, 4 for וַתַּחֲלֹחַל; ἦ *obstupuit*. § אִשְׁחַעְמִים; so, too, in 4, 4 for וַתַּחֲלֹחַל. אִשְׁחַעְמִים.

(7) For the pregnant construction, וְהַמֶּלֶךְ קָם . . . אֶל גֶּנֶחַ הַבַּיִת, cf. the last paragraph of nn. on 4, 4. W's conception of this passage is entirely wrong. It is perfectly natural that the King leaves the room and goes to the garden. In the first place, he was very much incensed and did not like to give vent to his anger in the presence of the Queen; many a man who is enraged will get up and leave the room rather than speak out in the presence of his wife. Moreover, the King wanted to have time to think the situation over. H was grand vizier and had no doubt a number of powerful adherents; so he could not be disposed of without due consideration. B states that the King went to the park *um in der freien Luft die erste Hitze des Zorns verrauchen zu lassen und zu überlegen, welche Strafe über H zu verhängen sei*. The King's suspicion had been aroused as soon as he learned from the official records that M, not H, had discovered the conspiracy (cf. n. on 6, 10). The

statement that the King left the room and went to the garden, is not a *grober und geradezu unerklärlicher Compositionsfehler* (W 18; contrast C 181, below). In a dramatic performance (see *Pur.* 38, 31; 12, 1) the audience would wait in breathless expectation for the reappearance of the King. When the King returned, he knew, of course, that H had no idea of assaulting the Queen; his remark, *Is he going to assault the Queen while I am at home?* is a cruel jest (C 200 calls it *tödtende Ironie*). It showed how the King was disposed toward H (C 200 says: *In diesen furchtbar ironischen Worten lag H's Todesurtheil*).

For גנת הבית see nn. on 1, 5.

For עמד, *remained* (not *stood up*, AV; *ἔ surrexit*; *عند*) see n. on 5, 1.

For אליו read עליו; see n. on 1, 17. *אֵלֶּיָּהוּ חָם חֲבֹתָי וְעַלֵּיָּהוּ אֵרֹם אֶחְתַּקֶּפֶת עֲלוּהִי בִישָׁחַ מְלוּחַ מְלֹכָא* **עַלֵּי מַלְכָּא*.

(8) The pointing נפל implies that H threw himself at the feet of E (cf. 8, 3) when the King returned. The translation *had thrown himself* (AV *was fallen*, S *war niedergefallen*, K *war niedergesunken*, *ἔ reperit Aman super lectulum corruisse*) would require the pointing נפל; for the pluperfect cf. n. on 1, 9. The participle is more dramatic. Also שב is participle, not perfect.

After על המטה we may supply (but not insert) להחזיק ברגליה or להנשק לרגליה; cf. ותחזק ברגליו (2 K 4, 27) and ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας (Matt. 28, 9) also נשקו בר (ψ 2, 12) *kiss the ground* = Assy. qāqqara nūššiqû (AJSL 19, 134; ZDMG 58, 630, n. 36). See e. g. KB 1, 28, 28; 32, 37: šepē'a iḡbatû-ma arimšunûti, *they clasped my feet, and I pardoned them*; KB 2, 178, 19: unaššiq šepē'a rēmu aršišû-ma, *he kissed my feet, and I granted him mercy*. If E was recumbent on a dining couch, H had to bow down *על המטה*, if he wanted to clasp, or kiss, the feet of the Queen. A man may kiss the hem of the garment of a lady to show his humble devotion to her; but her husband may misinterpret it. S's rendering *vor dem Diwan* is inaccurate. If H had fallen down before the couch, the King could not have made his cruel jest. Heb. על cannot mean *before*; it might mean *close to, hard by*; cf. GB¹⁴ 531^b, 3, c. This על is different from על שלחן (cf. our phrase *to sit over a meal*) &c (*Kings* 134, 27). If a man sits very close to a lady in a crowded car, he sits almost *upon* her. *ש* has in 8, 3 *על* *לפני רגליו* *דנפלה* *ח*. For מטה = *lectulus convivalis* (Talmud. *מיסב*) see BL 68.

*Syr. גרם is a transposed doublet (cf. *שולמה* = *שלמה*) of גמר = *כמל* = *גמל*; see last n. on c. 7; cf. AJSL 23, 245 (قعر = قعر) and 247 (مكر = كرم) also Arab. تجرم = *تجرم*. Cf. last n. on 4, 4.

For הגם לכבוש את המלכה עמי בבית see conclusion of first n. on v. 7; גם corresponds to the Ger. *etwa gar* (so, correctly, S) cf. *etiam* (Cic. *Tusc.* 2, 7, 17) and האך Job 40, 8; Gen. 18, 13, 23; Am. 2, 11.

אח לכבוש is not inf. with the prefixed preposition ל, but impf. with prefixed emphatic ל; see *Proverbs* 52, 11; AJSL 22, 201, l. 18; contrast GK²⁷, § 114, i, note 1; see also my paper on the *scriptio plena* of emphatic la- (לא) in OLZ 10, 305, and the remarks on Hag. 1, 9 in nn. on 3, 7.

W 18 remarks, the King does not say *the Queen*, which would be more correct and more impressive, he says: *soll denn dem Weibe in meinem Hause Gewalt angethan werden?* It is true that ש"ל have γυναικα, but א has את המלכה; so, too, טסא. On the other hand, ש"v has ἡ βασίλισσα in 1, 19 where the omission of this title in א is intentional.

אח הדבר refers, of course, to the cruel jest of the King (see conclusion of first n. on v. 7) not to a special command to execute H, as B supposes; the order to put the grand vizier to death is given at the end of v. 9 in the words תלהו עליו.

For חפ (3 *statim operuerunt faciem ejus*) read, with Condamin (*Revue biblique*, 7, 2, 258–261, cited by S) and Perles (*Analekten*, p. 32) חפּר, as in ψ 34, 6, following ש"v διατράπη τῷ προσώπῳ. The omission of the ר is due to haplography; for ר = ר = ר cf. פורחא (9, 8) = פרחתא and end of second paragraph of nn. on אחשוורוש (1, 1) also n. on ונדד for ונדדו in Nah. 33. S كاسبت ودهى, but ט ואפרי בהתא. S *da stand H schmachbedeckt* follows ט; but in his nn. he says: Owing to the reference to 6, 12, the reading of the received text is preferable: there M (*sic!*) was a חפרי ראש; now H's head is covered. S adds: Cf. for the game of dice, that took place between H and M, 3, 7; 9, 24–26.—If S had been able to carry his own notes through the press, he would probably have suppressed these remarks; cf. n. on 4, 7.

(9) For הרבונה see nn. on 1, 10. According to ש"v the eunuch who suggested the impalement of Haman was not הרבונה, but Βουγαθαρ = בתן who had been impaled according to 2, 23; see n. on 2, 22.

אח הנה גם does not mean *Huc accedit quod* (S). It implies an ellipsis, just as the גם in כי גם (Ruth 2, 21) *I might also state that*, or אף in אמר אף (Gen. 3, 1) which corresponds to our *by the way* or *à propos*; cf. also אף לא הביאה in 5, 12. Harbonah thinks H is a בן מות; he ought to be impaled, and we have not only a malefactor worthy of impalement, behold! there is also (גם) the pole which H set up for M.* If we render this גם by *Why*, we have again an ellipsis: *Why, there is the pole* means originally: *Why don't you impale him? There is the stake &c.*

* H's pole is a May-pole; see *Pur.* 11, 23; BL 102.

אשר דְּפַר־טוב על המלך (cf. 1 S 25, 30; Jer. 32, 42) could mean only *who made kind remarks about the King*, (AV *who has spoken good for the King*, LB *der Gutes für den König geredet hat*) but not *who did the King a good turn* or *who rendered the King a great service* (S *der doch für des Königs Heil gesorgt hatte*). We must point דְּפַר טוב and insert גָּמַל before this. \mathfrak{G}^v has simply Μαρδοχαῖος τῷ λαλήσαντι περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, in \mathfrak{G}^s a corrector has added ἀγαθά. Also \mathfrak{G}^l reads τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον τὸν λαλήσοντα ἀγαθὰ περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, \mathfrak{I} *qui locutus est pro rege*, \mathfrak{S} מלכא בנית מלכא ט, ח, א; חסבא לז חסבא חסבא על מלכא; דמליל טבא בנית מלכא ט, ח, א; חסבא לז חסבא חסבא על מלכא. cf. also \mathfrak{T}^2 259, 18; 260 7: די אמר טבתא על מלכא על מלכא.

The stem גָּמַל means *to complete, to mature, to wean, to do*; it may mean *to do good* or *to do evil* (cf. 1 S 24, 18) but, as a rule, it means, in Hebrew, *to do good*; cf. $\psi\psi$ 13, 6; 116, 7; 119, 17. Arab. جيلة *ja-mila* means *a good deed, a favor, benefit*. In Assyrian, on the other hand, *tûru gimilli, to return a deed* (HW 198^b) means, as a rule, *to return an evil deed, to retaliate*. Our verb *to retaliate* means now especially *to retaliate injuries*, but formerly one could say also *to retaliate favors*; *to retaliate* a visit meant *to return* a call, *to repay* a visit. Similarly *to requite* may mean *to recompense, to reward* or *to retaliate, to punish*; cf. הָשִׁיב אֲשִׁיב לּוֹ (= לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ or הָשִׁיב אֲשִׁיב הָשִׁיב אֲשִׁיב) verily *I will punish him (or them)* in Am. 1. 2 (see OLZ 10, 306).

The stem גָּמַל is a secondary modification of כָּמַל (Arab. كمل) with partial assimilation of the initial כּ to the sonant nasal (cf. *Nah.* 31, below) and גָּמַל is also allied to גָּמַר; cf. ψ 57, 3 (לֹאֵל גָּמַר עֲלֵי) and *Nah.* 26, below; 45, below.† The original root is כָּם (*Nah.* 35, below). Cf. also Assyr. *kamâlu, to be revengeful, to resent, be indignant*; *kimiltu, resentment, anger* = נִקְמָה (HW 335^b). Just as *to retaliate* was formerly used in the sense of *to repay* or *return a favor* &c, so the verb *to resent* could formerly be used in a good sense = *to receive with satisfaction*.

ח

(1) J thinks that מִה הוּא לֵה must be a secondary correction for לֵה נִבְעֵלָה לוֹ, E told the King that she had been M's wife. Very naive! Contrast 2, 3 (בְּחֹלָה) and last paragraph of nn. on 2, 7; cf. also J's restoration of כִּי אֵין הָצַר שׁוּה בְּנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ in nn. on 7, 4. \mathfrak{G}^v ὅτι ἐνωκείωται αὐτῇ does not presuppose a different text; it is merely an explanation of מִה הוּא לֵה, just as \mathfrak{I} *quod esset patruus suus*.

*For the transposed doublet גָּרַם in Syriac see footnote to n. on v. 7.

†Just as we find both גָּמַר and גָּמַל in Assyrian, so we have also both *pîru* and *pîlu, elephant*; cf. *qirbu* and *qablu* = *qalbu* (see last n. on 4, 4).

The meaning of the Septuagintal phrase is that E had been taken into M's house and adopted by him; *oikeios* means a *member of the family*; instead of *αὐτῇ* we must read *αὐτῷ*. מִן הוּא לָהּ and מִן הוּא לָהּ follow מ; לָהּ is due to a misunderstanding, but it does not seriously affect the sense.

(3) מִן הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב עַל הַיְּהוּדִים is a tertiary explanatory gloss to the preceding אֶת רֵעַת הַמֶּן הָאֲנִי; it is derived from יָשׁוּב מִחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ הִרְעָה אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב עַל הַיְּהוּדִים in the secondary addition 9, 25; cf. nn. on v. 5. For the prefixed *Waw explicative* see the remarks on וַאֲבִנְתָּא (1, 10) and n. on 1, 17; cf. also n. on 8, 6. For scribal expansions derived from parallel passages see n. on v. 14.

(5) וְכִשְׁר הִדְבֵּר לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעִינֵי. This is corrected in the margin of S^s. JS omit וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעִינֵי, S transposing clauses 2 and 3. The fourth clause, וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעִינֵי, does not imply that E takes a personal interest in the matter (as S supposes) but it is a coquettish climax, equivalent to our *if you really care for me a little*.

The clause מִחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ הַמֶּן בֶּן הַמִּדְחָא הָאֲנִי (S) is a scribal expansion interrupting the connection between אֶת רֵעַת הַמֶּן and אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב (which may be impersonal; cf. n. on v. 10). It is derived from the end of v. 3.

(6) The first clause of this verse seems to be a gloss (or *variant*; cf. last n. on 1, 4) to the second; אֵיכָנָה אוֹכֵל וְרֵאִיתִי means *How could I see* (S^v πῶς γὰρ δύνασθαι ἰδεῖν) not *How could I have seen* (B, Wd) lit. *How shall I be able and (how shall I) see*. For the perf. וְרֵאִיתִי after the preceding impf. אוֹכֵל see GK²⁷, § 112, p.

The idea (AoF 3, 3, below) that the final ך in אֲבָדֶךָ is due to Persian influence is just as fanciful as the explanation of בִּיתֶךָ; see conclusion of nn. on 1, 5. The constr. of אֲבָדֶךָ should be אֲבָדְךָ, not אֲבָדֶךָ; similarly the constr. of שְׁלַחֶךָ should be שְׁלַחְךָ, not שְׁלַחֶךָ; cf. nn. on בִּיתֶךָ (1, 5) and שְׂרִבִּית (4, 11).

(7) The clause עַל אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַח יָדוֹ בִּיהוּדִים is a gloss, just as יָשׁוּב (9, 25) is not original. The King did not give the order: חָלְהוּ עָלָיו (7, 9) because H had planned to exterminate all the Jews in the Persian empire; this plan had been sanctioned by the King. H was impaled because he had deceived the King (cf. second n. on 6, 10). The alleged assault on the Queen was merely a pretext (cf. n. on 7, 7). The gloss עַל אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַח יָדוֹ בִּיהוּדִים is derived from 9, 25 just as the scribal expansions in vv. 3 and 5.

(8) מִן הַיְּהוּדִים (so, too, S) means, of course, *concerning the Jews* (בְּגִין יְהוּדָאִין) not *to the Jews* (B). LB and AV *for the Jews*.

S in Betreff der Juden. Wd says, על היהודים may mean *in Betreff der Juden* or *an die Juden*; he thinks this equivocal phrase is intentional inasmuch as the letters were sent both to the satraps concerning the Jews and to the Jews themselves. But this view is erroneous; cf. third paragraph of nn. on v. 9.

Ⓢ^v has for בַּשֵּׁם הַמֶּלֶךְ and בַּטְּבַעַת הַמֶּלֶךְ:—ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου and τῆς δακτυλίου μου, but Ⓜ is no doubt more original. J, of course, prefers Ⓢ.

Ⓢ omits the first imperative כְּתֹב and the ך before הַתְּמִי, and reads בְּכָתֵב instead of כִּי כָתֵב (cf. n. on וְכָדִי, 1, 16) so that אֵין לְהַשִּׁיב appears, not as predicate to כָּתֵב, but as a relative clause (לְהַשִּׁיב) coordinated to the preceding relative clauses. Schultz misinterpreted אֵין לְהַשִּׁיב in the same way: the new letters sent by M are to be just as irrevocable as the letters sent by H.

Ⓜ נְהָתוֹם is not possible in a coordinated relative clause (J). Read נְהָתָם as in 3, 12. If נְהָתוֹם were correct, we might feel tempted to read it נְהָתוֹם as a pass. part. = Arab. مفعول. I pointed out in BA 1, 180 that مفعول for نفعول was originally a Nif'al form, the initial *m* being due to the analogy of the participles of the other derived conjugations.

(9) V. 9 containing 43 words (192 letters) is the longest verse in the כתובים, longer even than its anti-Jewish pendant in 3, 12.

Ⓜ סִיָּן = Babyl. Simānu (stem وسيم). For ך = *m* see *Pur.* 23, 19; 32, 24; cf. n. on 1, 9. Simānu, *appointed time, season* has passed into Heb. as זִמְן with partial assimilation of the initial ס to the sonant nasal (AJSL 22, 202, n. 9) as in זָקִים, *fetters* for זִנְקִים (Nah. 31, below). In Syriac the *v* = *m* is expressed by ܐܥܢܐ: (modern Syriac zōnā). For the *third month*, i. e. *Sivan* (ܣܝܒܐ *Siban*) Ⓢ^v has the *first month*, i. e. *Nisan*. In the margin of Ⓢ^s this has been corrected in accordance with Ⓜ. Ⓢ has סִיָּן (which is connected with סִיָּן, *boar*; see KAT³, 398, n. 5) for סִיָּן, just as Ⓢ uses סִיָּן for סִיָּן (2, 16) and סִיָּן for סִיָּן (9, 21). Jensen combines סִיָּן with the cuneiform name of a star (*Procyon?*) xabaçirānu (HW 268^a). The intervocalic *b* became *v* (ZA 19, 235; contrast AG², § 57, a) and this may have been elided; cf. also Heb. אִצָּר for mōṣar = māṣar = maṣṣar = maṣar (stem נצר) and אִסּוּךְ (2 K 4, 2) = מִסּוּךְ = אִשְׁמֹרֶת = מִשְׁמֹרֶת = אִמְתַּחַת = מִמְתַּחַת; see *Kings* 241, 24.

For אֵל הַיְּהוּדִים (Ⓢ לֹא יְהוּדָאִין Ⓢ^v ἐγράφη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις) read, following Ⓢ, 'עַל הַי', as in the preceding verse; cf. nn. on 7, 7 (אֵלִי) for 'עַלִי) and 1, 17. This 'עַל הַי' must be connected with the preceding

clause מִדְּרָכֵי אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֶלֶךְ, not with וַיִּפְתַּח. On the other hand, the אֶל before אֲחֵשְׁדֶּרְפִּים (see n. on 3, 12) depends, not on צִוָּה, but on וַיִּפְתַּח. S, correctly, מֶלֶךְ וְאֲחֵשְׁדֶּרְפִּים מֶלֶךְ וְאֲחֵשְׁדֶּרְפִּים. The instructions were, of course, sent to the Persian officials, not to the Jews. The ו before אֲחֵשְׁדֶּרְפִּים must be omitted; it was added after על had been miswritten אֶל. The prefixed ו is omitted in S; on the other hand S has in 9, 2 מֶלֶךְ וְאֲחֵשְׁדֶּרְפִּים instead of בְּעִרְיָהֶם בְּכָל מְדִינֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ; cf. also nn. on 9, 10, 29.

The proclamation was to be made known to all the peoples (בְּכָל לְבָבִים) in the Persian empire; in this way the Jews learned of it, so that they could organize armed resistance to defend their lives and protect their property. M learned what had happened, when H's decree was published in Susa (4, 1) although H had, of course, sent no special message to M. Contrast וַיִּשְׁלַח סִפְרִים אֶל כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים in 9, 20.

The gloss וְאֶל הַיְּהוּדִים נִכְתָּב וְנִלְשָׁנָם, at the end of the present verse, is due to the misreading אֶל הַיְּהוּדִים instead of עַל הֵי. The Jews have always adopted the language of the country in which they settled; the Persian Jews understood Persian, just as the Alexandrian Jews spoke Greek; it was not necessary to write to them in Heb. or Aramaic; cf. n. on last clause of c. 1.

(10) The verbal forms וַיִּחַתּוּ, וַיִּשְׁלַח are impersonal; cf. remarks on אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב (v. 5) and הִפִּיל (3, 7). G^v ἐγράφη, ἐσφραγίσθη, and ἐξαπέστειλαν; but it is not necessary to read וַיִּפְתַּח, although S renders וַיִּשְׁלַח; nor need we read (with J) וַיִּשְׁלַח.

For רָצִים, *couriers* see n. on 3, 13.

רָכְבִּי הָרֶכֶשׁ is an explanatory gloss to the following בָּסוּסִים. Another glossator has added the Pers. term הָאֲחֵשְׁתֵּרִיִּים, and בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִּים is a tertiary explanation of this antiquarian gloss; cf. v. 14 where בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִּים is omitted. G^v has for בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִּים simply διὰ βιβλιαφόρων (*per veredarios*) and at the beginning of v. 14 G^v substitutes for בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִּים the term οἱ ἱππεῖς (*veredarii celeres*) but a corrector has added in G^s: καὶ ἐπιβάται τῶν πορίων οἱ μεγιστάνες. S omits the gloss בָּסוּסִים, and substitutes for the antiquarian gloss, giving the Pers. name of the royal horses, a Pers. word for the *couriers*:—מֶלֶךְ. For the Wav explicative in מֶלֶךְ cf. n. on 1, 17. LB *reitende Boten auf jungen Maulthieren*, AV *posts on horseback*, and *riders on mules, camels and young dromedaries*. According to Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 3, 67 both אֲחֵשְׁתֵּרִיִּים and בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִּים refer to the couriers, not to their horses; but this is erroneous. J considers בָּסוּסִים רָצִים a ridiculous combination; but modern couriers often travel on horseback

(or in automobiles) although *courier* means originally *runner*. We also have now *mounted infantry*.

𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 means *racers*; this might mean *race-horses* or *swift dromedaries*; but Herod. 5, 14; 8, 98 favor the meaning *race-horse*; see *Kings* 80, 45. Θ και τοῖς ἄρμασι = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 instead of 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 (1 K 5, 8) is not good; no scribe would have corrupted 𐤓𐤕𐤓 into 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓; cf. remarks on the emendation κλήρων for ἑμῶν in nn. on 3, 7. Heb. רכוש, *property* means originally *mount*=*animal for riding*; cf. Assy. rukûšu (see *Ezra* 57, 38) whereas Syr. ܡܢܬܐ means originally *property* and then especially *animal for riding*. In Mic. 1, 13 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤇𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤇 𐤋𐤓𐤕𐤓 is corrupt; it cannot mean *bind the chariot to the swift beast*; but the meaning of the passage may be: *Abandon the chariot for the racer*, i. e. try to get away as quickly as possible, not in a chariot, but on the back of a swift horse. 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 may be a corruption of 𐤓𐤕𐤓, although the reading of 𐤀𐤓 is confirmed by Θ ψόφος = 𐤓𐤕𐤓 = 𐤓𐤕𐤓 (not = 𐤇𐤓𐤓, as Marti supposes). Σ 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓; cf. Gen. 46, 29: 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 = 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓. Heb. רשׁ to cast down may mean *to cast off*; cf. השליך 2 K 7, 15; Eccl. 3, 6, and 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 (Ex. 23, 11).

𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 is derived from Old Pers. khšātra, *dominium*; so it means *dominicus*. Instead of 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 we must point 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 (cf. n. on 3, 12). This was the name of the horses kept for the personal use of the King (cf. 6, 8: 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓). The horses (saddle horses and teams) kept by a landed proprietor for his personal use are often called in Germany *Herrschaftspferde* (i. e. seigneurial or manorial horses) in distinction from the *Wirtschaftspferde*, i. e. the farm-horses, work-horses, &c. B (436, 3) correctly states: *Wir müssen wohl an herrschaftliche Pferde denken, welche in königlichen Gestüten gross gezogen wurden*; cf. the Ger. *Trakehner*. 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 (naked) seems to be a corruption of 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓, *courier*, and 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓 is a transposition (cf. footnote to n. on 7, 7) of 𐤓𐤕𐤓 = Syr. ܬܒܠܐ = *tabellarius*. Cf. conclusion of seventh n. on 7, 4 (𐤓𐤕𐤓 = 𐤓𐤕𐤓) and *Kings* 84, 3; see also last n. on 4, 4.

For 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓, which would mean *sons of the herdsmen* (cf. Syr. ܬܒܠܐ, *herdsman*) we must read 𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓, † *sons of the herds* or *studs*, i. e. *bred in the royal studs* for the special use of the King. In Syriac, ܬܒܠܐ means a *herd*, especially of horses; in the Talmud, 𐤓𐤕𐤓 seems to denote a cross between a jackass and a mare, i. e. a *mule*; instead

† In the same way 𐤓𐤕𐤓, *horses* must be pointed 𐤓𐤕𐤓, not 𐤓𐤕𐤓; the latter form (Syr. ܬܒܠܐ) means *horsemen*. The objections raised by Arnold (*JBL* 24, 45) are not valid. It is true that we use *horse* for *horsemen*.

of רָמָה it would be better to read רָמָה (= rāmāk). Nor does Arab. رَمَكَة, rāmaka denote a *blood-horse*, bred in a stud; in fact, it means an *inferior mare*. But such changes of meaning are not uncommon; the word *mare* means in German (*Mähre*) a *mean* or *poor horse*, a *jade*; هَجِين hajin means in classical Arabic *of low origin*, a *mean* or *poor horse*, but in modern Arabic it is used for *fast dromedary*. The etymological equivalent of *knave* in German, *Knappe*, means *squire of a knight*, while in modern English, *knave* is used for *rogue*. J's objections against the interpretation *sons of the studs* are gratuitous. Cf. Fleischer in Levy's Talmudic dictionary, 4, 487^b. The stem רמך may be Semitic; it may be a transposition of כרם; cf. Arab. كَرِيم karīm, *noble* and our *well-bred*. The primitive meaning is *dug = tilled, cultivated, cultured*; see AJSJ 23, 247; cf. conclusion of preceding note.

(11) The clause אֲשֶׁר נָתַן הַמֶּלֶךְ לַיהוּדִים means, of course, *that* (AV, incorrectly *wherein*; so, too, C 217) H; S *wodurch*) *the King had given* (permission) *to the Jews* (cf. יָנַחַן, 9, 13, and *Kings*, 113, 7) *not which he had given to the Jews*, referring to the horses. S's statement that the King presented those horses to the Jews is unwarranted.

לְהִקָּהֵל does not mean *to assemble*, but *to organize themselves*, to take concerted action. ℣^v interprets this to mean χρῆσθαι τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν; cf. 1 M 6, 59: στήσωμεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νομίμοις αὐτῶν, 10, 37: καὶ πορεύεσθωσαν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν. At any rate, the idea is not that they should assemble on the day of the massacre planned by H, but that they should assemble in advance to organize armed resistance for the 13th of Adar. If they had assembled on that day, they would have been unable to protect their property. Cf. n. on 9, 2.

The phrase לְעִמּוּד עַל נַפְשָׁם (لَعَمْرُكَ لِنَفْسِكَ) means *to defend their lives*, lit. *to stand up for their lives* (see *Pur.* 34, 1). *To make a stand* means *to take a position of defense and resistance*. The heading of c. 8 in AV correctly states: *Ahasuerus granteth to the Jews to defend themselves*. This is much more appropriate than the summary given in LB: *Die Juden haben Erlaubniss sich an ihren Feinden zu rächen*. The idea of the King is not, that the Jews may attack any one who is supposed to be unfriendly disposed toward the Jews; they only receive permission to resist any attack. The repetition of the terms used in the edict of H, לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְהַרְגַּם וּלְאַבֵּד, implies that the Jews shall be permitted to resort to retaliatory measures: if any one attempts לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְהַרְגַּם וּלְאַבֵּד אֹתָם, then יִשְׁמְדוּ וְיַהַרְגוּ וְיַאֲבִדוּ אֹתָם. If the Russian Jews had been permitted to organize themselves for self-defense, the majority of the pogroms (see *Pur.* 35, 11) would never have happened; cf. n. on 9, 5. It is true that ℣^v has instead of לְעִמּוּד עַל נַפְשָׁם רְגוֹ: — βοηθῆσαι τε αὐτοῖς καὶ χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀντιδίκους αὐτῶν καὶ

τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις αὐτῶν ὡς βούλονται, but this is not the original Heb. text; it seems to be derived from ריעשן בשנאיהם כרצונם (at the end of 9, 5) which is omitted in \mathfrak{G}^v . Even βοηθησαί τε αὐτοῖς is not an accurate rendering of לעמד על נפשם. The Heb. phrase corresponds to Ger. *Nothwehr* (i. e. *self-defense*)* while the Greek phrase corresponds to the Ger. *Selbsthülfe*. *Selbsthülfe* (taking the law into one's own hands) may be more aggressive than *self-defense*.

\mathfrak{M} חיל is a gloss; S: (alle) *Bewaffnete* (*des Volks und der Satrapien*). Cf. also third n. on 9, 16.

For הצר הצרים read הצררים אהם: cf. Num. 10, 9: הצר הצררי אהתם. A participle may take a verbal suffix (cf. עשני &c, GK²⁷, § 116, f) but the substantive צר cannot be construed with אה. S has for את ית כל חילות עמא ופילכא ט כל חיל עם ומדינה הצרים אהם (דמעיקן יתהון simply *לחלם, יעצב להם*). LB *die sie ängstigten* is misleading; AV, correctly, *that would assault them*.

S's suggestion, that we should supply לתן המלך ליהודים after הצר[ים] אהם is gratuitous; at any rate this addition would be just as superfluous as the second עשה after למדינות in 2, 18. It is probably due to his misunderstanding of the clause אשר נתן המלך ליהודים at the beginning of this verse.

S's note, *Die Lesart* (הצררים אהם instead of הצררים אהם) *ist zweifelhaft, da man nicht erwarten wird, dass diese Bedränger von Weibern und Kindern werden angegriffen werden*, is due to some uncorrected misunderstanding, just as the remarks referred to in n. on 4, 7. \mathfrak{M} טה ונשים is a scribal expansion derived from 3, 13 (see *Pur.* 34, 5) but S's remark, *von Weibern und Kindern hatte man schwerlich Gefahr für sein Leben zu befürchten* is unwarranted: a heathen woman might assault a Jewish woman, a heathen boy might attack a Jewish boy; some heathen children might kill an old Jew &c.

\mathfrak{M} טה ונשים ושללם לבזו is a gloss derived from 3, 13 (cf. n. on רחופים, v. 14). The phrase מנער ועד זקן is omitted by the glossator in the present passage. \mathfrak{G}^v omits זקן מנער ועד even in 3, 13. On the other hand, \mathfrak{G} adds τέκνα in 7, 4. In c. 3 these additions are appropriate, because all the Jews were to be exterminated, and H had promised to pay 10,000 talents into the royal treasury. Therefore all the Jews had to be killed, both young and old, women and children; and their property had to be confiscated, otherwise H would not have been able to pay the 10,000 talents. Here, however, the Jews received permission only to organize themselves and to defend their lives (לעמד על נפשם) by slaying, if necessary, all the people of the provinces who

*In Moses Schulbaum's *Deutsch-Hebr. Wörterbuch* (Lemberg, 1881) עמירה על נפשו is given as the Heb. equivalent of *Nothwehr*.

assaulted them (הַצִּירִים אֹחֵם). They had permission only לְשַׁלַּח יָד בְּמִבְקָשֵׁי רֵעֵהֶם (9, 2) i. e. to lay hands on those who attempted to do them harm; they were allowed forcibly to resist a forcible attack upon their persons or property. ἔ^v ἀμύνονται (16, 20) does not mean *they may be avenged on them* (so AV) but *they may repel them*. Wd's conception that the enemies of the Jews were to be massacred without being able to offer any resistance (*die Feinde der Juden sollen wehrlos von diesen umgebracht werden*) is unwarranted. B-R 360 (l. 13) correctly states, the Jews were granted permission, *alle welche . . . sie bedrängen, zu tödten*. Similarly S says, *Den Juden wird durch ein Decret das Recht gegeben, für den 13. Adar Schutzmassregeln gegen ihre Feinde zu treffen*; but he makes the gratuitous addition *und dieselben mit Weib und Kind auszurotten*. Even the received text speaks only of the slaying of their assailants.

Driver (LOT⁶, 486) says: If all these measures were taken *in self-defense*, they need no justification; but the terms of the narrative itself make it extremely difficult to think that this was the case. This statement, however, is incorrect, just as the statement that it seems impossible to acquit M of permitting an *unprovoked* massacre. Nor, continues Driver, can the request in 9, 13 be excused. But the gibbeting of H's ten sons and the second massacre in Susa may have been necessary in order to prevent further anti-Jewish outbreaks. The personal safety of the Queen and the Grand Vizier made it necessary in Susa to teach the enemies of the Jews a lesson.

(13) The phrase לְהִנָּקֵם מִן הַצִּירִים (ס) (לְאַתְּפֹרַע מִבְּעָלֵי דַבְּבִיהוֹן ט) does not mean to take vengeance (cf. also *Pur.* 34, 7) but to inflict just punishment (AV to avenge themselves on their enemies). The verb נָקַם is used in the Maccabean psalm Nah. 1, 2 of God; see Nah. 53, i; 52, vii (also vi). Cf. אֵל נִקְמָת (ψ 94, 1) and Is. 1, 24: וְאַנְקָמָה מֵאוֹיְבָי וְהִוִּי אֲנָחֶם מִצָּרֵי (for ח = ק see *Kings* 187, 21). Injuries inflicted by the assailants of the Jews are to be avenged, but there is to be no revengeful spirit, no indulgence in resentful and malicious feelings, no unrestrained revenge. This may be too ideal a picture, but this explanation is no doubt in harmony with the view of the narrator; cf. וּבְבִזָּה לֹא שְׁלַח אֶת יָדָם (9, 10). J's emendation 'לְהִנָּקֵם מִן הַצִּירִים' instead of לְהִנָּקֵם מֵאוֹיְבֵיהֶם is gratuitous.

(14) J thinks that וְדַחוּפִים is a gloss to מִבְּהָלִים; but it is merely a scribal expansion derived from 3, 13; so, too, the following בְּדַבֵּר מִבְּהָלִים וְדַחוּפִים (cf. footnote to n. on 2, 3). The combination would be an anticlimax, just as צָהָלָה וּשְׁמָהָה at the end of v. 15. If it were original (ס has simply מְשַׁחֲמָה) we would expect דַּחוּפִים וּמִבְּהָלִים; the passive participle דַּחוּפִים means *pushed, urged, driven*, while מִבְּהָלִים means *eager*: in 3, 13 the couriers carried out the com-

mand of H, because they were compelled to obey his orders, even if they were distasteful to them; here the couriers are not **מִבְּהָלִים**, but **דְּרוֹפוּתִים**, i. e. they take a personal interest in the matter; cf. n. on 2, 9. For **מִבְּהָלִים** read **מִבְּהָלִים**.

Also the clause **וְהָיָה בְּשׁוּשַׁן הַבִּירָה** (**ἔξετέθη δὲ τὸ πρόσταγμα καὶ ἐν Σούσοις**) is a scribal expansion derived from 3, 15 (contrast B). **§** takes **וְהָיָה** as a relative clause, coordinating **וְהָיָה** to **וְהָיָה**. Similarly **S** renders: *und das Dekret war gegeben in der Königsburg zu Susa*, i. e. *and the decree (which the couriers were ordered to transmit to the satraps) had been given in the royal castle of Susa* (K: the couriers left . . . as soon as the decree had been given in the castle of Susa; this would be **כְּהֵנָּה וְגו'**; cf. n. on 3, 4).

(15) For **תַּכְלֵת וְהָיָה** (which is omitted in **Ḡ^v**; but **Ḡ^s** *ἡλικιὴν ἀπέλιπεν*) read **הָיָה וְהָיָה**, just as we have **וְהָיָה וְהָיָה** after **וְהָיָה**; cf. n. on 1, 6.

מ **וְהָיָה זֶהב גְּדוּלָּה** (omitted in **Ḡ^l**) is a gloss; cf. n. on 7, 8. **Ḡ^v** *στέφανον ἔχων χρυσοῦν*, **§** **וְהָיָה זֶהב גְּדוּלָּה**, **Ḡ** **וְהָיָה זֶהב גְּדוּלָּה**.

מ **וְהָיָה וְהָיָה** is rendered in **Ḡ^v** *καὶ διάδημα βύσσινον πορφυροῦν* (**Ḡ^l** *περιπόρφυρον*). **Ḥ** *amictus serico pallio atque purpureo*; **§** **וְהָיָה וְהָיָה**.

מ **צְהִלָּה** (omitted in **Ḡ^{vl}**) means *she roared, shouted*; see *Nah.* 39, 1. 5. **B** *kreischte* (shrieked, screamed with delight). The people of Susa, at least the majority of them, exulted over the downfall of H and the elevation of M; their boisterous mirth was not due to the edict published in favor of the Jews, as B would have it. **J** thinks we ought to substitute **וְהָיָה וְהָיָה** for **וְהָיָה וְהָיָה**. But **צְהִלָּה** is correct; **צְהִלָּה וְהָיָה**, however, is an anticlimax, just as **מִבְּהָלִים וְהָיָה** (v. 14). The second verb is an explanatory gloss.

The term **אֹרֶה**, *light* is especially appropriate inasmuch as **M** and **E** were originally gods of light; see *Pur.* 9, 36; 10, 32; 11, 20; 22, 6; 26, 34; cf. *MDOG*, No. 33, p. 35, below; also *ZDMG* 61, 287, 21.

(17) **Ḡ^v** prefixes to *ἰουδαῖον* = **מִתִּיחֲדִים** the verb *περιετίμνοντο καὶ*. **Ḡ^l** substitutes *περιετίμνοντο* for **מִתִּיחֲדִים** (**Ḡ** *מִתִּיחֲדִים*). **§** has simply **מִתִּיחֲדִים**. **C**'s emendation **מִתִּיחֲדִים** is unnecessary. It is possible that **מִתִּיחֲדִים** means *Judaizing* in the sense of *sympathizing with the Jews, favorably disposed toward the Jews*; cf. *Hellenizers* &c; Arab. *taqaiiasa* means *to side with Qais* (*WdG* 1, 37). Contrast **הִנֵּלִים עֲלֵיהֶם** (9, 27).

ט

(1) \mathfrak{G}^v has here $\tau\rho\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$ = בשלושה עשר יום; so, too, in 8, 12; contrast last n. on 3, 7. In \mathfrak{G}^s a corrector has substituted $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$.

For ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים לשלוח בהם \mathfrak{S} has simply לְהַעֲשׂוֹת , depending (contrast SG^2 , § 249, D) on the preceding לְהַעֲשׂוֹת = להעשות. Both clauses, ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים and ביום אשר ישלחו היהודים המה בשנאיהם לשלוח בהם seem to be scribal expansions.

The pronoun הוא does not refer to יום, as B and Wd state; ונהפוך הוא means *it was changed* (Keil) = לְהַפְּכֵהוּ . AV *it was turned to the contrary*.

(2) \mathfrak{M} נקהלו (so, too, 9, 16) is pluperfect; cf. nn. on עשתה (1, 9) and נקהלו (8, 11). The apodosis does not begin with נקהלו (AV, K) but with ונהפוך (LB) cf. n. on וכדי (1, 17).

For מבקשי רעתם \mathfrak{S} has חַבְּרֵי שָׂטָנָם . The meaning of the Heb. phrase is undoubtedly *who tried to do them bodily harm &c*, not *who were unfriendly disposed*; cf. Num. 35, 23 (והוא לא אויב לו) and 1 S 24, 10 (25, 26).

The clause ותעמדו לא עמד פניהם does not mean *no one stood up against them*. The enemies of the Jews attacked them, but could not prevail against them. There is a difference between איש לא עמד פניהם and איש לא קם לפניהם, although Wellhausen reads $\text{עָמְדִי} = \text{קָמִי}$ in ψ 55, 19. AV, correctly, *no one could withstand them*; so, too, S (*Niemand konnte vor ihnen bestehen*) but in the introductory remarks prefixed to his nn. on c. 9 he makes the unwarranted statement: *Die Judenfeinde werden am dreizehnten des Monats Adar ausgerottet. Vom Schrecken gelähmt wagen sie keinen Widerstand, sondern lassen sich im ganzen Reiche ruhig hinmetzeln* (cf. n. on 4, 7). The same mistake is found in \mathfrak{J} (*nullusque ausus est resistere*). Cf. n. on ותעמדו (5, 1) and Nah. 53, iv: זעמיו מיייעמוד לפניו, *who can endure His fury*. Heb. עמד, *to abide* may mean *endure, remain firm*, and קום, *to stand* may have the same meaning (cf. *to stand fire &c*). Nor is it necessary to read בפניהם (באפיהון) as in Josh. 10, 8; 21, 42; 23, 9. Wd's statement, *Es wird nicht gesagt, dass die Heiden anfangen; schon die, welche das Unglück der Juden suchten, wurden umgebracht. Jeder also, der im Rufe eines Judenfeindes stand, ward getödtet*, is gratuitous.

The clause at the end of this verse, כי נפל פחדם על כל העמים, is an illogical scribal expansion derived from the end of c. 8; cf. n. on 8, 14; see also passages like Deut. 2, 25; 11, 25; Josh. 2, 9, &c. The reason why no one could withstand them was not, that all the gentiles were

frightened, but that the Jews were fully prepared for the attack and had organized a vigorous resistance and defense.

(3) For עָשִׂי מִלֵּאכָה see n. on 3, 9.

אִם מִנְשָׂאִים does not mean *extolled* (J *extollebant*, S *مَنْشَأَ*, G^v *ἐτίμων*, T² *בִּישְׁבָּהִים*, LB *erhoben*) but *they supported* (AV *helped*).

Also the clause at the end of v. 3, כִּי נָפַל פָּחַד מִרְדֵּכִי עֲלֵיהֶם, is a scribal expansion. It is expressed in G^{VL}, but G^v omits v. 4. S has בִּלְךְ instead of מִרְדֵּכִי. The reason why the satraps &c favored the Jews is given in v. 4.

(4) In the same way the clause at the end of v. 4, כִּי הָאִישׁ מִרְדֵּכִי הוּלֵךְ וְגִדּוּל, is due to scribal expansion; הוּלֵךְ is inf. absol. (*cf.* n. on הִנְחָה, 2, 18).

(5) אִם וְהָיָה וּבִדְבָר וְאִם is a scribal expansion, due to וְהָיָה וְאִם in the following verse (*cf.* n. on 8, 14).

The term כִּרְצוֹנָם (S *صَلَحَ*, A *صلح*, T *כִּרְעוּתָהוֹן*) at the end of v. 5 implies that the authorities did not interfere (*cf.* v. 3). If the authorities had allowed the Jews to organize armed resistance, the numerous massacres in Russia during the past few years would have been nipped in the bud (*cf.* n. on לַעֲבֹד עַל נַפְשָׁם, 8, 11). But, as a rule, the assailants of the Russian Jews were supported by the governors, military commanders, officers of the police, &c (see *Pur.* 35, 21; 43, 15. 22. 32. 38. 44. 46. 48; 44, 2). אִם כִּרְצוֹנָם does not mean *to their hearts' content* (French *à cœur joie*; this would be כְּחֲתָוֶת לִבָּם or כְּנַפְשָׁם). It implies simply that the Persian Jews had free hands in dealing with their assailants owing to the non-interference on the part of the authorities. Syr. *أَمَّيْ فِي خَلْبِي* means *in my opinion, in my judgment*. The Persian governors &c received no instructions to suppress all anti-Jewish demonstrations (the royal edict issued by H could not be repealed; *cf.* 8, 8^b) but they did not support the assailants of the Jews, and allowed the Jews to defend themselves. In this way the permission granted by H's edict was not worth more than the pound of flesh which Portia* allowed Shylock to cut from the body of Antonio.

(6) The addition of הַבִּירָה (S *صَبْرَا*) is due to scribal expansion; the fight between the Jews and their assailants did not take place in the Acropolis, but in the City of Susa (*cf.* nn. on 1, 2; 4, 17). In vv. 12-15 we find simply שׁוֹשֵׁן הַבִּירָה, not שׁוֹשֵׁן הַבִּירָה. The scribes did not know the exact meaning of הַבִּירָה; they regarded it as a kind of *epitheton ornans*; *cf.* Assy. Uruk supûru (JAOS 22, 8, n. 7). No importance can be attached to G^v ἐν Σούσις τῇ πόλει, for G^v has the same rendering

**Cf.* the interesting appendix to part iii (Vienna, 1907) of D. H. Müller, *Die Mehri- und Soqotri-Sprache*, pp. 159-165, entitled *Die Wanderung der Portia-Sage*; *cf.* *ibid.* pp. 23-33: *Die Portia von Gischin*, and pp. 73-87: *Die Portia von Zafâr*; see also ZDMG 61, 495.

in 1, 2. For the occasional effacement by the scribes of characteristic diversities see *Nah.* 18 (*ad v.* 4) and *OLZ* 10, 307, below.

The addition of **ואבד** implies that 500 were dead or missing; *cf.* n. on **להשמיד להרג ולאבד** (3, 13). In the present passage **ס** has simply **מג** = **הרג**, but in v. 12: **מג** **מג** **ס** **ס** **ס**. In both passages **ואבד** seems to be due to scribal expansion, just as **והרג ואבדן** after **מפת חרב** (v. 5). The glossator, of course, did not intend **ואבד** as inf. absol. (*cf.* n. on **הנחה**, 2, 18) but as perfect (for **ואבדו**). *Cf.* n. on **וקבל** (v. 27).

(7) The names of the ten sons of H are just as doubtful as the names of the seven eunuchs (1, 10) or the names of the seven (?) councilors (1, 14). **ט** follows **מ**; also the names in **י** are almost identical with those given in **מ**; in **ס**, and especially in **ט**, the divergences (which are to some extent due to popular adaptation) are greater, as is evident from the following table:

מ ט	ט ^v	ט ^l	ס	י
1 פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא	Φαρσαν καὶ Νεσται ^a	Φαρσαν (καὶ τὸν)	פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא	<i>Pharsandatha</i>
2 דֶּלְפֹּן	Δελφῶν	ἀδελφόν ^f	דֶּלְפֹּן	<i>Delphon</i>
3 אֶסְפָּתָא	Φασγα ^b	Φαρνα	אֶסְפָּתָא	<i>Esphatha</i>
4 פֹּרָתָא	Φαραδαθ ^c	Γαγαφαρδαθα ^g	פֹּרָתָא	<i>Phoratha</i>
5 אַדְלִיָּא	Βαρσα ^d		אַדְלִיָּא	<i>Adalia</i>
6 אַרִידָתָא	Σαρβαχα		אַרִידָתָא	<i>Aridatha</i>
7 פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא	Μαρμασιμα	Μαρμασαιμα	פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא	<i>Phermestha</i>
8 אַרִיסַי	Πουφαῖον		אַרִיסַי	<i>Arisai</i>
9 אַרִידַי	Ἀρσαῖον		אַרִידַי	<i>Aridai</i>
10 יֶזָתָא	Ζαβουθαῖον ^e	Ιζαθουθ	יֶזָתָא	<i>Jezatha</i>

(a) Corrected in **ט**^s to *Φαρσαννεσται*, **ט**^a *Φαρσανέσταν*.—(b) **ט**^a *Φαγα* (L *Φασα*).—(c) **ט**^s *Φαρααθα*, **ט**^a *Βαρδαθα*.—(d) **ט**^a *Βαρελ* (L *Βαρσα*).—(e) **ט**^s *Ζαβουδεθαν*, **ט**^a *Ζαβουγαθα*.—(f) **ט**^l *καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ* is, of course, a corruption of *Δελφῶν*.—(g) *Γαγα* may be due to dittography of *γα* in the preceding name in **ט**^v, *Φασγα*; **ט**^l reads *Φαρνα*, but this may be a corruption of *Φασγα*.—(h) **ט**^a *Ζεζ*.

ט^a *Φαρσανεστας* may be more original than **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא**; the **ד** in **מ** may be miswritten for **ס**. **ס** **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא** is a transposition of **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא** (so **ט**^a) which may be a corruption for **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא** (**י** transposed, **ס** miswritten for **פ**, **א** miswritten for **ד**; see *SG*², § 2, C). The form **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא** is no doubt influenced by the Syr. word **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא**, *beauty*; corruptions of names are often not merely graphic but also due to popular etymology and adaptation; *cf.* *ZDMG* 61, 195, 9; 276, 8. 22. 28. Syr. **פֶּרְשֵׁנְדָּתָא** means *foolishness*.

Ⲭⲓ Φαρσαν καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ is a corruption of Φαρσαν . . . ταν καὶ Δελφων. In Ⲭ ⲙⲥⲣ, the ⲙ is miswriting for ⲙ. The ε in Δελφων may be due to the influence of Δελφοί, δελφίς, δέλφαξ. Δελφίς and Δελφίων are Greek proper names.

Φασγα may be transposed from Ασφαγ, and this may be a corruption of Ασφατ (with Γ for Τ; cf. last n. on 2, 14) = Ⲡⲥⲧⲁⲧ. Ⲭ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ is phonetic spelling (see *Kings* 279, 52) for Ⲡⲥⲧⲁⲧ.

(8) *Paraðatha* may be more original than פורתא; the ך may stand for ܚ, and ܚ for ܕ; cf. note on הַפֿוֹ (7, 8) for הַפֿוֹר. The reading פֿורתא is favored also by Ⲭⲓ (Γαγα)φαρδαθα and Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ (Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ) for ⲙⲥⲣⲓ. The *l* instead of *d* in Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be due to dissimilation; see ZDMG 61, 194, 13; 195, 4 (cf. also بلخشان = Badakhshān; see JHUC, No. 114, p. 111^b). The insertion of the ܬ in Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be influenced by the Greek words in Syriac which begin with ⲙⲥⲣ; cf. Brockelmann's *Lex. Syr.* 286. Ⲭⲓ Φαρααθα is miswriting for Φαρδαθα (with Α for Δ) cf. φουραι for φουρδι (see n. on v. 26).

ⲙⲥⲣⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ is supported by Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ. The initial ⲙ of ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be due to dittography of the final ⲙ of the preceding פורתא (for פֿורתא) just as the prefixed Γαγα in Ⲭⲓ Γαγαφαρδαθα may be due to dittography (or rather *tritography*) of the second syllable of the preceding Φασγα; see above, n. g. The prefixed ⲙⲥⲣ before each of the ten names may be secondary. Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be a corruption of Αρελ = ⲙⲥⲣ = ⲙⲥⲣ; the initial B may be due to the preceding name, Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ = Ⲭⲓ Φαραδαθα.

Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ corresponds to ריר of ⲙⲥⲣⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ; Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ has preserved the ܚ. The transposition may be due to the fact that ⲙⲥⲣⲓ is more common in Syriac than ⲙⲥⲣⲓ. Owing to the vocalic character of the *r* there is not much difference in Syriac between initial ܚ and ⲙⲥⲣ; cf. SG², § 52 (also § 32) and for the dropping of the final ܚ see § 26, C. Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be a corruption of Αρδαθα, the initial Σα is perhaps due to dittography of the second syllable of the preceding Βαρσα. Αρβαχα (for Αρδαθα) may be influenced by the Persian names 'Αρβάκης, 'Αρβάριος, 'Αρβιάνης, &c.

(9) Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be a corruption of ⲙⲥⲣⲓ (with ⲙ for ⲙ, ⲙ for ⲙ, and ⲙ for ⲙ) influenced, perhaps, by ⲙⲥⲣⲓ, *persuasion, supplication*. Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ stands for ⲙⲥⲣⲓ, ⲙⲥⲣⲓ; the ⲙ is due to corrupt dittography of the following ⲙ. Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ = Βαρμαστω = Φαρμαστω; for *m* = *b* = *p* see AJSJL 23, 235, n. 46; cf. n. on Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ = ⲙⲥⲣⲓ (1, 10) and ⲙⲥⲣⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ (Am. 4, 3) for ⲙⲥⲣⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ (cf. ψ 32, 4 and BL 45, n. 1; also above, n. on 2, 7).

Ⲭⲓ ⲙⲥⲣⲓ is miswritten for ⲙⲥⲣⲓ, and ⲙⲥⲣⲓ may be miswritten for ⲙⲥⲣⲓ = 'Ρουφαίος. Cf. 'Ρωπάρας.

𐤌𐤊𐤍 stands for 𐤊𐤍𐤊. 𐤄 'Apsaios seems to correspond to No. 8: אֲרִיסִי; it may be originally a variant of 'Pouphaïos = אֲרִיסִי which may be a corruption of רופִי (see above).

𐤌𐤊𐤍 seems to be shortened from Βαζουθαίος, in 𐤄^v transposed: Ζαβουθαίος. 𐤌𐤊𐤍 may be a corruption of וזותא, Vazutha (with 𐤊 for 𐤊 and transposition) cf. אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ (1, 1) for אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ. 𐤄^l Ιζαθουθ may be a corruption of Ιζαβουθ = Ζαυβουθ = Βαυζουθ = וזותא = וזותא. Ch (EB 5245) thinks that וזותא is a corruption of צִרְפֶּתִי. It seems to me more probable that all the names of H's sons are corruptions of Jerahmeel. Cf. footnote to n. on 2, 14.

All these explanations are, of course, entirely conjectural (see *Pur.* 27, 40, which might have been cited also in ZDMG 61, 195, 14) but it is important to show that all those divergences (apparently irreconcilable) may be derived from the same text. B's statement, that some of the names in 𐤄 are entirely different, is an exaggeration; Wd even says that [all] the names of the sons of H appear in 𐤄 in an entirely different form.

The Persian etymologies given by Benfey and Benary (quoted in B) are no doubt unsatisfactory (for Scheftelowitz see my remarks in AJP 27, 164; cf. J's preface) but J's Heb. etymologies are worse. J combines Βαρσα = אֲדִלִּיא with the name of the King of Sodom, בִּרְשָׁע (Gen. 14, 2) and 'Pouphaïos is supposed to be רִפְאִי יְהוָה; for 'Apsaios J compares יַעֲרִשִׁיהָ; Φάσγα, J thinks, may be a corruption of פֶּסַחִי; and פרש:אחא (for פרשנחא) is supposed to be פֶּרֶשׁ נִצְחִים, *eques gloriæ*.

(10) It is hardly necessary to add that the καὶ before τοὺς δέκα υἱοὺς Αμυ in 𐤄^l is secondary, just as the 𐤊 before אַחְשִׁירֶשׁ in 8, 9. Four of the ten names have dropped out in 𐤄^l (just as four of the names of the seven councilors are not represented in 𐤄; see nn. on 1, 14). Therefore the remaining six names were no longer felt to be identical with the ten sons of H.

Instead of 𐤌𐤊𐤍 בן המדחא S has 𐤌𐤊𐤍.

(11) Gen. 6, 13 affords no parallel to בא לפני המלך which is equivalent to انتهى الى الملك, whereas בא לפני is synonymous with בלבי נתן and נשאני לבי = Assyr. našannî libbî (HW 484^b). It corresponds to the Assyr. ana šakān abûbi ūbla libbašun in l. 14 of the cuneiform account of the Deluge; see my remarks *ad loc.* in KAT² (cf. HW 231^a).^{*} The phrase בא לפני in Gen. 6, 13 means *it is put before my mind* (for consideration) or *suggests itself to me*; בא לפני cannot mean *According to me the end of all flesh is come*, i. e. *the extermination of mankind is at hand according to my opinion*. Ezek. 7, 6 does not prove that בא לפני does not

^{*}For Jensen's translation *die Sturmfluth zu machen* "brachte hervor" ihr Herz die grossen Götter (KB 6, 231) see my remarks in JAOS 22, 9.

depend on בא. Nor is it possible to derive קץ from קיץ, *to loathe* (AoF 3, 396: *taedet me generis humani*). This idea is expressed in vv. 6, 7. Cf. also Am. 8, 2: בא הקץ על עמי.

(13) § omits אם על המלך טוב.

For the justification of E's request to gibbet the ten sons of H see last n. on 8, 11.

(16) נקהלו is pluperfect (as in v. 2) and means *they had organized themselves*; contrast ויקהלו in v. 15. A new קהלה was necessary as soon as the Jews learned that the edict was to be in force for one more day.

B proposes to read נקום instead of נוח (G^v ἀνεπαύσαντο, § ٤٤٤٤) and R (in K) proposes to read להנקם (8, 13) or נקום; also GB¹⁴, 44^b states that we must read an inf. of נקם; see, however, AJSL 21, 141, n. 21 and the remarks on the emendation κλήρων for ὑμῶν in nn. on 3, 7. נוח מאיבהם is a misplaced gloss (cf. n. on 3, 7) with Waw explicative (cf. n. on 1, 17) to נוח in v. 17; it is probably derived from v. 22 (cf. n. on 8, 14).

Instead of 75,000 (so, too, T³§) G has 15,000 (μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους) M is more original; G represents a subsequent mitigation. S's statement that G as well as T³§ have 15,000 instead of 75,000 is incorrect; cf. n. on 4, 7. We need not suppose that 75,000 represents the aggregate number of the enemies of the Jews (the soldiers of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors) who were slain by the Jews in the Maccabean battles, although this may have been the opinion of the glossator who added the gloss חיל in 8, 11. We read in 1 M 11, 47 that 3,000 Jews, which Jonathan (the Maccabean prototype of Mordecai; see second n. on 6, 8) had sent to Antioch, at the request of King Demetrius II, about the end of b. c. 145, slew 100,000 men there in one day. The whole city was at the mercy of the Jews (κατεκράτησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῆς πόλεως ὡς ἡβούλουντο, cf. רועשו היהודים כרצונם, v. 5). This, it may be supposed, is the historical prototype of the slaughter of the assailants of the Jews in the Persian empire under the reign of Xerxes.

(17) S's rendering, *Am dreizehnten Tage des Monats Adar da fanden sie Ruhe, und den vierzehnten machten sie zu einem Tage des Festmahls und der Freude*, is impossible. K connects ביום שלושה עשר לחדש אדר (at the beginning of v. 17) with בשנאייהם המשה ושבעים אדר ובבזה לא שלחו את אלף in the preceding verse, the intervening clause את ידם being regarded as a parenthesis. In G^v this clause is transposed: ἀπώλεσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους τῇ τρισκαίδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀδάρ, καὶ οὐδὲν διήρπασαν. For G^v τρισκαίδεκάτῃ (= M) G¹ has τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ (cf. last n. on 3, 7). The clause ובבזה לא שלחו את ידם, which severs the connection between אלף בשנאייהם המשה ושבעים אדר and ביום שלושה עשר לחדש אדר, seems to be a scribal expansion, derived

from the end of v. 10 (*cf.* footnote to n. on 2, 3). The סוף פסוק should be after אדר.

(18) V. 18 is omitted in S.

(19) K^{ethiv} הפרוזים, Q^{erê} הפרזים (as though the ך were due to dittography of the ך; *cf.* n. on אחשורוש, 1, 1) owing to the following פרז; but Talmudic פרז means *inhabitant of an unwall'd place*, and הישבים בערי פרזות is merely an explanatory gloss to הפרוזים. In pre-Maccabean times Jerusalem was the only fortress; all the other towns were פרזות; *cf.* W 96, below. According to B and S the K^{ethiv} is incorrect. J renders freely: *Hi vero Judæi qui in oppidis non muratis ac villis morabantur*. S has מְבָלָה מְבָלָה מְבָלָה מְבָלָה, just as G^v renders οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ διασπαρμένοι ἐν πάσῃ χώρᾳ τῇ Ἑξω. T יהודאי די הוו בכפרוניה, T² יהודאין פציחאי דיתבין בקירוי פציחאי דקיקתא. At the end of the verse G adds: οἱ δὲ κατοικοῦντες ἐν ταῖς μητροπόλεσιν καὶ τὴν εἰ καὶ ἰ τοῦ Ἀδαρ εὐφροσύνην ἀγαθὴν ἄγουσιν ἐξαποστέλλοντες μερίδας καὶ τοῖς πλησίον. This addition was originally omitted in G^v.

For מנות (= מִשְׁאָת; see n. on 2, 18) *cf.* מנותיה (2, 9). Meg. 7^a we read that Rabbi Jēhudah sent Rabbi Osha'yah a leg of veal and a pitcher of wine (רבי יהודה נשיאה שדר ליה לרבי אושעיה אטמא). T renders: משדרין דורון (δῶρον). J *partes epularum et ciborum*.

(20) Wd thinks it not impossible that vv. 20-28 and 29-32, which B considers to be a subsequent addition, were taken from an older source, and that E was composed for the purpose of explaining these two documents, just as some critics believe that the object of the Book of Jonah is to explain the psalm in c. 2; contrast AJSL 23, 256. B (376, below) stated: *Die Einschaltung 9, 20-32 wird aus einem anderen Purim-Buche in unser Purim-Buch hineingestellt sein*. But it is a mistake to suppose that the entire section 9, 20-32 is derived from a different source. The first three verses (20-22) are genuine, also the first part of 26 and vv. 27 and 28^a; but vv. 23-25, the second part of v. 26, v. 28^b, and 29-32 represent secondary additions. They were not taken from an older source, but added by a later glossator (*cf.* Pur. 44, 31).

M, the prime minister, had received reports from all the governors of the provinces, stating what had happened on the 13th of Adar, how many assailants of the Jews had been slain, and how the Jews had celebrated the following day. M sent this information to all his coreligionists in the Persian empire, urging them to commemorate this notable event for all time to come.

(21) לקים (לקיימא) is Aramaic (*cf.* last but one n. on 1, 8). Ruth 4, 7, where we find לקים, is a gloss. The phrase עליהם

means to enjoin upon them. § has **וְיִסְמְכֶם חֲסִידֵיכֶם**. § reads also **וְיִסְמְכֶם מִלֵּן חֲסִידֵיכֶם** at the beginning of v. 23.

For **עֲשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעַת עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אָדָר וְאֶת יוֹם חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר** § has **חֲסִידֵיכֶם מִלֵּן חֲסִידֵיכֶם**, just as § uses **סִיּוֹן** for **סִיּוֹן** in 8, 9. For **יִסְמְכֶם** cf. **יִסְמְכֶם** (Prov. 7, 20).

(22) The **כ** in **כִּימִים** (**כִּימִים יוֹמִיָא** ; **בִּזְמַן יוֹמִיָא** ; cf. n. on **וּכְדִי**, 1, 17) is not the *Kaph similitudinis*, but the *Kaph veritatis* (GK²⁷, § 119, x).

(23) The section vv. 23–25 is a gloss; see n. on v. 20. The immediate sequel of v. 22 is v. 26: — **עַל כֵּן קִרְאוּ לַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּה פּוּרִים** — *therefore* (i. e. on account of the **מִשְׁלַח מִנּוֹת אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ וּמִתְּנוֹת לְאֶבְיוֹנִים** *they called these days Purim* (i. e. *portions*, from **פּוּרִי** = **פּוּרְדִי** = Vedic *pūr̥ti*, *portion*). It was of course unnecessary in this connection to add after **עַל שֵׁם הַפּוּר** the explanation: **הוּא הַמִּנָּה**. The statement **הַפִּיל הַפּוּר** in v. 24 and 3, 7 is quite different: it involves a new etymology of **פּוּר**, and therefore it was necessary to add the explanation.

The Persian term **פּוּרִים** is equivalent to Heb. **מִנּוֹת**, *portions* or *presents of food* (cf. Neh. 8, 10, 12) exchanged at the Purim festival. The singular of **פּוּרִים** was not **פּוּר**, but **פּוּרִי** = **פּוּרְדִי**, the Middle Iranian form (**purdē*) of Vedic *pūr̥ti* (syn. *dakṣiṇa*) *portion*, especially the portion given by the offerer to the sacrificer; cf. **בִּנְהָ** Ex. 29, 26; Lev. 7, 33; 8, 29. The omission of the **ד** (which is preserved in **φουρδῖ**) is due to haplography; cf. n. on **אַחַשְׁוֵרֶשׁ** (1, 1). **φουρπαι** (i. e. *watches, vigils*) is a popular adaptation of **φουραι** (with A for Δ) = **φουρδῖ**. This popular etymology may have been suggested by the *vigils* (cf. **שִׁמְרִים**, Ex. 12, 42) or *watch-meetings* which have been held on New Year's eve from times immemorial. The Purim festival is a Jewish adaptation of the Persian spring festival *Naurōz*, and this is derived from the Babylonian New Year's festival (about the time of the vernal equinox) so that **פּוּרִים** = **מִנּוֹת** corresponds to Lat. *strenae*, French *étrennes*. The observance of the Persian New Year's festival was combined with the commemoration of Nicanor's Day; see *Pur.* 3, 6; 4, 41; 9, 26; 10, 39; 14, 40; 17, 7, 23; 46, 24, 29, 32; * 50, 37; 51, 10; 52, 4; ZDMG 61, 275, 17; 277, 1.

For **קָבַל** read, with **קָבַל**; so, too, Oort; cf. the **Q^{er}** in v. 27 and *Kings* 127, 46; 269, 6. The verb **קָבַל** is Aramaic (cf. last n. on 4, 7) but it is not a denominative verb derived from **קָבַלָה** (B, W).

The clause **וְהָיָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לַעֲשׂוֹת** refers to the celebrations of the victory over their assailants, and **וְהָיָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב מִרְדֵּיכַי אֱלִיהֶם** alludes to the two days of feasting on the 14th and 15th of Adar. The Jews in Susa had celebrated the 15th day; the provincial Jews, the 14th. M recommended the perpetual general observance of both days.

* In l. 22 read Franz for Harder.

ישוב מחשבתי הרעה אשר חשב על היהודים על ראשו וחלו, (Neh. 5, 18) and WdG 2, 164, below. The statement of the glossator, ישוב מחשבתי הרעה אשר חשב על היהודים על ראשו וחלו, is at variance with the original narrative; the glossator might have said: ישוב מחשבתי הרעה אשר חשב על מרדכי; cf. n. on 8, 7.

(26) For the first part of v. 26 see n. on v. 23. The author of the original Book may have known that פור (or rather פורי=פורי) was a Pers. word for מנה. S reads *מִכְלָחֵם מִן הַכֶּסֶף הַזֶּה חֶמֶץ*. S reads *חֶמֶץ*; here *חֶמֶץ* may be a corruption (or adaptation) of *חֶמֶץ*. Instead of *חֶמֶץ* it would be better to point *חֶמֶץ*. T has *בְּגִין כֵּן קָרוּ לְיוֹמֵיָא*; קרו ליומתי האילין פוריא על שום \mathfrak{T}^2 ; האילין פוריא על שום פיסא. In \mathfrak{T}^2 פוריא is derived from פורתא, *wrath*, i.e. *punishment, trial* (cf. AJSL 23, 227, l. 11; ZDMG 61, 286, 30) from פור, *to boil* (see Nah. 43). The rendering *Unheil* (given in Dalman's *Wörterbuch*) is unwarranted. \mathfrak{T}^2 may have combined פוריא with פורה, *winepress* = *Blutbad* (massacre, carnage). See Pur. 51, 38 and third paragraph of nn. on 3, 7.

The second part of v. 26 is a gloss explaining the על כן at the beginning of the verse, with special reference to קימו at the beginning of v. 27. The על כן to be explained is repeated at the beginning of the explanation; see *Ezekiel* 41, 16.22.27 and the translation of Ezek. (SBOT) p. 1, below; p. 94, below; cf. also gloss τ in my restoration of ψ 68 (AJSL 23, 239 and 224)). Two explanations of על כן are given; the first is: על כל דברי האפרת הזאת ומה ראו; the second: על ככה ומה. The second is a tertiary gloss explaining the preceding gloss: ומה הגע עליהם, על כל דברי האפרת הזאת=על ככה. ומה ראו. The phrase על כל דברי האפרת הזאת was sufficiently explicit; therefore this tertiary gloss substitutes simply על ככה; but ומה ראו might be misunderstood, and was therefore explained by ומה הגע עליהם, in order to make it clear that מה ראו did not mean *what they had seen*, but *what they had experienced*; cf. the explanation of פורתא in \mathfrak{T}^2 , quoted above, ועקתא דארע יתון. S's rendering, *Deswegen, nach allen den Worten des Briefs, so wohl in Betreff dessen, was sie selbst dieserhalb erlebten, als dessen was sie betraf, setzten die Juden fest*, is monstrous (cf. n. on 4, 7). Also AV and K connect the verb at the beginning of v. 27 with the preceding clause.

(27) For קימו read וקימו. This is the sequel of the clause at the beginning of v. 26, על כן קראו לימים האלה פורים על שם הפור, the verb קימו being coordinated to קראו.

The following וקבל (Q^rē) is a gloss to the preceding קימו; it was added owing to the וקבל at the beginning of the gloss vv. 23-25.

ס has simply סמכא for both קימו וקבל; cf. n. on v. 21, also footnote to n. on 2, 3.

אל הנלויים refers to the *proselytes* (contrast מיתיהדים in 8, 17).

For עליהם we must not read אליהם (contrast last n. on 4, 5). In עליהם this preposition means *in addition to*; see *Kings* 125, 7.

אל ולא יעבור (cf. 1, 19) is misplaced; it should be transposed to the end of this verse, after בכל שנה בשנה, and instead of ולא יעבור we must read ולא יעברו, referring to את שני הימים האלה; cf. the gloss in v. 28^b. The letters ו and ר are easily confounded; cf. n. on חפר (7, 8). For transposition of ו see also *Nah.* 41 (ולוהב for לוהב, &c).

ס ככתבם וכזמנם, according to their writing and according to their time (but ס אב וזמנא סמכא means according to the written traditions concerning these days (festal regulations, festal legends, &c; see *Pur.* 11, 35; 9, 22) and according to their dates, viz. the 14th and 15th of Adar; i.e. the last full moon of the שנה, the tropical year (*AJSL* 22, 256). For the reason why the two spring festivals, Purim and Passover, are not celebrated at the vernal equinox, on the first day of the first month, but on the 14th and 15th days of the 12th and the 1st months, respectively, see conclusion of n. on v. 31. For the two days of the festival cf. ביום ההורש השני (1 S 20, 34). B's view that ככתבם refers to M's letter (vv. 20, 23) is erroneous. For זמן cf. n. on סיון (8, 9).

(28) The second part of this verse is an explanatory gloss, not only to the first part of v. 28, but also to the end of v. 27. ס has נחש for יסוק, and נחש for יעברו.

(29) Verses 29–32 represent a subsequent addition.

בת אביחיל, which seems to be a tertiary addition, see n. on 2, 15.

The prefixed ו in מרדכי is a secondary addition (cf. n. on v. 10). The original text of this gloss was no doubt: ותכתב אסתר המלכה את כל תוק מרדכי היהודי לקים את אגרת הפרים, *Queen E described all the power of the Jew M in order to enjoin this Purim message* (which M had sent to the Jews; see vv. 20–22) i.e. E sent a letter to all the Jews setting forth M's capacity for action and performance (especially ὅσα ἐποίησεν, what he had accomplished for his coreligionists and what he might accomplish for them in the future) and urging them to observe the feast of Purim as prescribed by M. V. 32 (ובאמר אסתר) speaks only of E, not of M. ⁵ reads in the present verse: καὶ ἔγραψεν Εσθηρ ἡ βασίλισσα θυγάτηρ Αμναδαβ καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ὅσα ἐποίησαν. The original reading may have been καὶ ἔγραψεν Εσθηρ ἡ βασίλισσα θυγάτηρ Αμναδαβ ὅσα ἐποίησεν (so ⁶) Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος.

אל תוק את כל cannot mean with all strength, with all energy; AV with all authority; K unter Einsetzung ihres ganzen Ansehens;

¶ omni studio. This expression would be still more peculiar than the phrase *אמר עם הספר* (v. 25). *With all energy* or *most emphatically* might be expressed by *בכל חזקה* or *בכל חזקה*, but not *את כל חזקה*. *I love thee with all my strength* (cf. Mark 12, 30) would be *אהבך בכל מאורי* (cf. Deut. 6, 5). The prefixed *את* must be the *nota accusativi*; so *טט*² (*ית כל חוקפא*). For *את*=*ית* see *Nah.* 25. *§* has *חַתָּה מִן־לֵב* for *את כל חזקה*.

א is a tertiary gloss; cf. n. on 2, 14. Also *הוא* is a subsequent addition.

(30) V. 30 is omitted in *§*.

א *וישלח* (*§* *וישלח*) is impersonal (cf. n. on 8, 10). But the original text may have been *והשלח*; the masculine form may have been substituted after *מירדני היהודי* (v. 29) had been transposed. In Cant. 2, 7, on the other hand, the feminine form has been substituted for the masculine form (*את האהבה*) because *עד שיהפץ* may have reminded some readers of Job 40, 17: *יהפץ זנבו כארז*, where *זנב* = *cauda* *Hor. Sat.* 1, 2, 45; 2, 7, 49. The original meaning of *הפץ* = *سحب* is *intendere*. Cf. the explanation of the *scriptio plena* *ישינה* (Cant. 5, 2) BL 33.

For *במלכות* read *במלכות*; cf. n. on *בבית* (1, 9) and GK²⁷, § 118, g; *§* *במלכות*.

א *דברי שלום ואמת* (*§*, transposed, *אמת ושלום*) does not mean *words of peace and truth* (so AV; S *Worte des Friedens und der Wahrheit*; *¶ ut haberent pacem et susciperent veritatem*; *טט*² *מילי* *דרשלמה ודקושטא*) but *words of greeting and faithfulness* (cf. *Psalms* 80, 27). LB *mit freundlichen und treuen Worten*, K *mit freundschaftlichen und wohlgemeinten Worten*. The Queen, of course, did not send a warlike message or a statement that was not true; but she sent her coreligionists friendly greetings, emphasizing the fact that she would remain a faithful Jewess and never abandon the religion of her fathers.

(31) *א* *ואסתר המלכה* after *מירדני היהודי* is a tertiary gloss.

The *עליהם* in *עליהם קים כאשר* does not refer to *זמניהם*, as Wd supposes, but to the Jews; cf. *לקים עליהם* in v. 21.

א *דברי הצומות וזעקתם*, at the end of this verse, means *the procedures* (cf. n. on 1, 13) or *institutions of the great fast* (plur. intens.) *and their crying* (or *invocation*), *§ט* *צלותהון*, *טט*² *דצומא* *מילי* *ורתעניתא*. This refers to 4, 1.3.16. M had *cried with a loud and bitter cry* (*ריזעק זעקה גדלה ומרה*) and the Jews had fasted, wept, and lamented (*צום ובכי ומספד*) when the edict of H became known. Afterwards E asked M to fast with all the Jews of Susa for her sake, three days and three nights, before she went to the King, and E herself with her maids fasted in the same way.

The statement in the present passage, . . . לָקִים אֶת יְמֵי הַפָּרִים, דְּבָרֵי הַצּוּמוֹת וְזִעְקָתָם . . . would seem to imply that the Jews had adopted the fasting (and crying) before they adopted the feasting. They may have observed the Babyl. New Year's festival at first as a fast-day, but the less orthodox Jews (the Sadduceans) may have gradually adopted the celebration of the (Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (just as many modern Jews celebrate Christmas). This was afterwards sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but the date was changed: the feast was celebrated, not at the beginning of the first month, but at the middle of the preceding month, just as the ancient Heb. spring festival, the Passover, was not celebrated at the beginning (new moon) of the first month (about the time of the vernal equinox) but at the middle (full moon) of the first month, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish Passover and the Babylonian New Year's festival.

During the Babyl. Captivity Ezekiel (about 570 B.C.) recommended to observe the Day of Atonement on the 1st of Tishri, while the New Year was to be celebrated on the 10th of Tishri, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish New Year with the Babyl. festival at the beginning of the second half of the year. Under Persian dominion, about 500 B.C. (when the Priestly Code was compiled in Babylonia) the two festivals in the seventh month, as prescribed by Ezekiel, exchanged places so that the Day of Atonement was observed on the 10th of Tishri, because the Persians celebrated the *μαροσφόνια* on that day. Cf. n. on v. 27 and *Pur.* 4, 20-37; 20, 3; 33, 14.

(32) Wd's view that בספר refers either to the book from which the author took the two letters (cf. n. on v. 20) or to our Book of E, is gratuitous. Heb. בספר does not necessarily mean *in the book* (AV) it may also mean *in a book* (so K, S) see *Kings* 191, 37.

י

(1) For the misplaced gloss in v. 1 see fourth paragraph of nn. on 2, 18.

(2) In v. 2^a we must transpose ^a and ^β: the opening clause, וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה גְדֻלָּתוֹ, should follow the second clause, וּפְרִשְׁתָּ גְדֻלָּתוֹ, וּפְרִשְׁתָּ גְדֻלָּתוֹ, וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה גְדֻלָּתוֹ; even the first clause וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה גְדֻלָּתוֹ refers to M, not to the King.

The clause וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה גְדֻלָּתוֹ is a scribal expansion derived from 5, 11; it cannot mean *whereunto the King advanced him* (so AV; K *zu der ihn der König erhob*) nor does it mean *whom the King advanced* (so S; *לְמַעַן מַלְכָּא*, *די רבייה מלכא*, *די רבי יתיה מלכא* ², or *whereby the King had advanced him* (B; *ἢ qua exaltavit Mardocheum*). Cf. footnote to n. on 2, 3.

(3) For וַגְּדוֹל בִּיהוּדִים it would be better to read וַגְּדוֹל לִיהוּדִים. יֵאָבֵד מִבְּנֵי הָ. The ל instead of ב seems to be due to the ל in מִשְׁנֵה לְמֶלֶךְ and to the following clause, וְרָצִי לְרַב אַחִיו, omitted in S) which, of course, does not mean *acceptable to most of his brethren* (contrast n. on 4, 3) but *acceptable to the multitude of his brethren*, i.e. to his numerous coreligionists (so B, S). In the large number of his coreligionists there was not one who disliked him. Cf. רַב בְּנֵי, *the large number of his sons* (5, 11).

The phrase הָרַשׁ טוֹב לְעַמּוֹ means: he tried to promote the interests of the Jews, while וְדַבֵּר שְׁלוֹם לְכָל זֶרְעוֹ implies that he was not haughty and distant, but affable and kind to the meanest among his brethren, in spite of his exalted position. For דַּבֵּר שְׁלוֹם S refers to Zech. 9, 10; ψ 85, 9. Cf. ψ 122: אֲדַבֵּר-נָא שְׁלוֹם בְּךָ and אֶבְקֶשָׁה טוֹב לְךָ.

[The Hebrew text follows.]

9, 22 עשר בו בכל שנה ושנה: כימים אשר נחו בהם היהודים מאיביהם והחדש אשר נהפך להם מיוגון לשמחה ומאבל ליום טוב לעשות אותם ימי משתה ושמחה ומשלח מנות איש לרעהו ומתנות לאבינים: ^ρ על כן קראו לימים האלה פורים על שם הפור: ^{27. 26} 'וקימו' היהודים עליהם ועל זרעם ועל כל הנלוים עליהם {} להיות עשים את שני הימים האלה ככתבם וכזמנם בכל שנה ושנה: {ולא יעברו':} 28 והימים האלה נזכרים ונעשים בכל דור ודור משפחה ומשפחה מדינה ומדינה ועיר ועיר: ^φ

10, 2 {} ופרשת גדלח מרדכי: {וכל מעשה תקפו וגבורתו} הלוא הם 3 כתובים על ספר דברי הימים למלכי מדי ופרס: כי מרדכי היהודי משנה למלך ^ρ וגדול ^β ב'יהודים ורצוי לרב אחיו דרש טוב לעמו ולבר שלום לכל זרעו:

9, 23 וקב'ו' היהודים את אשר החלו לעשות ואת אשר כתב מרדכי אליהם: 24 כי המן בן המדתא היגא'גי צרר כל היהודים חשב על היהודים לאבדם כה והפל פור (הוא הגורל) לה'מם ^{ββ}: ובבאה לפני המלך אמר ^γ ישוב מחשבתו הרעה אשר חשב על היהודים על ראשו ותלו אותו ואת בניו על העץ:

26 (σ) על כן על כל דברי האגרת הזאת ומה ראו ^{δδ} 27 (τ) וקב'ו' וימי הפורים האלה לא יעברו מתוך היהודים וזכרם לא יסוה מזרעם 28 (υ) ותכתב אסתר המלכה {} את כל תקוה {} מרדכי היהודי לקים את ל אגרת הפרים ^{ςς}: וישלח ספרים אל כל היהודים אל שבע ועשרים 29 (φ) ומאה מדינה 'במלכות אחש'ר'ר'ש דברי שלום ואמת: לקים את 31 ימי הפרים האלה בזמניהם כאשר קים עליהם מרדכי היהודי ^{ηη} וכאשר קימו על נפשם ועל זרעם דברי הצומות וזעקתם: ומאמר אסתר 32 קים דברי הפרים האלה ונכתב בספר:

10, 2 (α) אשר גדלו המלך 3 (β) אחש'ר'ר'ש

9, 24 (ββ) ולאבדם 9, עם הספר (γγ) על כה ומה הגיע אליהם 26 (δδ) בת אביחיל (εε) 29 הזאת השנית (ςς) 31 ואסתר המלכה (ηη)

9, 6 מִפֶּת חֶרֶב^ו וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בִשְׁנֵאֵיהֶם כְּרִצּוֹנָם: וּבְשׁוֹשָׁן^ה הָרְגוּ הַיְּהוּדִים^י
חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ:

7 וְאֵת פֶּרְשֵׁי־חָמָא וְאֵת אֲרִידָתָא:

9 וְאֵת פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא וְאֵת דִּלְפּוֹן

וְאֵת אֶסְפָּתָא: וְאֵת אֲרִידָתָא

8 וְאֵת אֲדִלְיָא

וְאֵת וְזֹחָתָא:

י עֲשֶׂרֶת בְּנֵי הַמֶּן בֶּן הַמֶּדָּתָא צָרַר הַיְּהוּדִים הָרְגוּ וּבִבְזָה לֹא שִׁלְחוּ
אֶת יָדָם:

12. 11 בְּיוֹם הַהוּא בָּא מִסְפֵּר הַחֵרוּגִים בְּשׁוֹשָׁן^א לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ: וַיֹּאמֶר

הַמֶּלֶךְ לְאַסְתֵּר הַמַּלְכָּה בְּשׁוֹשָׁן^א הָרְגוּ הַיְּהוּדִים^ה חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ

וְאֵת עֲשֶׂרֶת בְּנֵי הַמֶּן בִּשְׂאֵר מְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ מִהָ עָשׂוּ וּמִהָ

שֶׁאֵלֶתָךְ וַיִּפְתָּן לָךְ וּמִהָ בְקֶשֶׁתְךָ עוֹד וַיַּעַשׂ:

13 וַחֲמָאֵר אֶסְתֵּר אִם עַל הַמֶּלֶךְ טוֹב יִפְתָּן גַּם מִחֵר לַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר

בְּשׁוֹשָׁן לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּדַת הַיּוֹם וְאֵת עֲשֶׂרֶת בְּנֵי הַמֶּן יִתְּלוּ עַל הָעֵץ:

14 וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לַהֲעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן וַחֲתָנָן דָּת בְּשׁוֹשָׁן וְאֵת עֲשֶׂרֶת בְּנֵי הַמֶּן

תִּלְווּ:

טז וַיִּקְהֲלוּ הַיְּהוּדִיִּים אֲשֶׁר בְּשׁוֹשָׁן גַּם בְּיוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ

אֲדָר וַיִּהְרְגוּ בְּשׁוֹשָׁן שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ וּבִבְזָה לֹא שִׁלְחוּ אֶת יָדָם:

16 וּשְׂאֵר הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר בְּמְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ נִקְהֲלוּ וַעֲמַד עַל נַפְשָׁם {}

17 וַחֲרֹג בִּשְׁנֵאֵיהֶם חֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁבַעִים אֶלֶף [] בְּיוֹם שְׁלוֹשָׁה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ

אֲדָר [י] וְזֹחַתָּא {} בְּאַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר בּוּ וַעֲשָׂה אֹתוֹ יוֹם מִשְׁתָּה וּשְׁמִיחָה:

18 וַהֲיִהְיִיִּם אֲשֶׁר בְּשׁוֹשָׁן נִקְהֲלוּ בְּשְׁלוֹשָׁה עָשָׂר בּוּ וּבְאַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר

19 בּוּ וְזֹחַת חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר בּוּ וַעֲשָׂה אֹתוֹ יוֹם מִשְׁתָּה וּשְׁמִיחָה: עַל

כֵּן הַיְּהוּדִים הַפְּרוּזִים עָשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אֲדָר

שְׁמִיחָה וּמִשְׁתָּה וַיּוֹם טוֹב וּמִשְׁלַח מִנּוֹת אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ:

כ וַיִּכְתֹּב מִרְדֵּכִי אֶת הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיִּשְׁלַח סְפָרִים אֶל כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים

21 אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל מְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ^ה הַקְּרֹבִים וְהַרְחֹקִים: לֵקִים עֲלֵיהֶם

לַחַיּוֹת עָשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אֲדָר וְאֵת יוֹם חֲמִשָּׁה

(ה) ה, 9 והרג ואבדן (θ) 6 הבירה (ι) ואבד (κ) 11 הבירה

(λ) 12 הבירה (μ) ואבד (ν) 16 ובבזה לא שלחו את ידם

(ξ) 16 ונזח מאיביהם (ο) 19 הישבים בערי הפרזות (π) כ, 9 אחשיקר"ש

- 8 האחשדרפנים והפחות ושרי המדינות אשר מהדו ועד כוש שבע ועשרים ומאה מדינה מדינה ומדינה ככתבה ועם ועם כלשנו^θ;
 י ויכתב בשם המלך, ויהתם בטפעת המלך וישלח ספרים (ביד הרצים
 11 "רכבי הרכש^א): אשר נתן המלך ליהודים אשר בכל עיר ועיר להקהל ולעמד על נפשם להשמיד ולהרג ולאבד את כל "עם
 12 'מדינה' ומדינה הצר'רים אתם": ביום אחד בכל מדינות המלך^ז
 13 בשלושה עשר לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר): פתשגן הכתב (להנתן דת בכל מדינה ומדינה) גלוי לכל העמים ולהיות היהודיים עת'דים ליום הזה להנקם מאיביהם;
 טו. 14 הרצים רכבי הרכש^ו יצאו מ'הלים": ומרדכי יצא מלפני המלך בלבוש מלכות^ה חור² ויתכלת^ה ותכריך בוץ וארגמן והעיר שושן צהלה^ט: ליהודים היתה אורה ושמחה וששון ויקר: ובכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל עיר ועיר מקום אשר דבר המלך ודתו מגיע שמחה וששון ליהודים משתה ויום טוב ורבים מעמי הארץ מתיהדים כי נפל פחד היהודים עליהם;
 א, 9 ובשנים עשר חדש (הוא חדש אדר) בשלושה עשר יום בו אשר הגיע דבר המלך ודתו להעשות^א ונהפוך הוא^ב: נקהלו היהודים בעריהם בכל מדינות המלך^י לשלח יד במבקשי רעתם ואיש לא עמד לפניהם^ד: וכל שרי המדינות והאחשדרפנים והפחות ועשי המלאכה אשר למלך מנשאים את היהודים: כי גדול מרדכי בבית המלך ושמעו הולך בכל המדינות^ז: ויפו היהודים בכל איביהם

- 8, 9 ואל היהודים ככתבם וכלשונם (ι) י, 8 אחש'רש (κ) בסוסים (θ)
 א, 9 האחשתרנים^{ττ} (λ) 11 חיל (μ) טה ונשים ושללם לבוז (ν)
 12 אחש'ר'ש (ε) 14 האחשתרנים (ο)
 (π) ודחופים בדבר המלך והדת נתנה בשושן הבירה
 טו (ρ) ועטרת זהב גדולה (σ) ושמחה
 א, 9 ביום אשר שברו איבי היהודים לשלוט בהם (α)
 (β) אשר ישלטו^{αα} המה בשנאיהם (γ) 2 אחש'ר'ש
 2 (δ) כי נפל פחדם על כל העמים (ε) 3 כי נפל פחד מרדכי עליהם
 4 (ζ) כי האיש מרדכי הולך וגדול

- ה, 7 ויאמר המלך^ב ילאסתר המלכה מי הוא זה ואי זה הוא אשר
 6 מ'ל'א" לבו לעשות כן: ותאמר אסתר איש צר ואויב המן הרע
 7 הזה והמן נבעת מלפני המלך והמלכה: והמלך קם בהמתו
 ממשתה היין אל גפת הביתן והמן עמד לבקש על נפשו מאסתר
 8 המלכה כי ראה כי כלתה עליה הרעה מאת המלך: והמלך שב
 מגפת הביתן אל בית משתה היין והמן נפל על המטה אשר אסתר
 עליה ויאמר המלך הגם לכבוש את המלכה עמי בבית הדבר
 יצא מפי המלך לפני המן הפרזי:
 9 ויאמר הרבונה אחד מן הסריסים לפני המלך גם הנה העץ אשר
 עשה המן למרדכי אשר גמל' דב'ר טוב על המלך עמד בבית המן
 י גבה המשים אמה ויאמר המלך תלכו עליו: ויתלו את המן על
 העץ אשר הכין למרדכי וחמת המלך שככה:
 א, 8 ביום ההוא נתן המלך^ב לאסתר המלכה את בית המן צרר
 היהודיים ומרדכי בא לפני המלך כי הגידה אסתר מה הוא לה:
 2 ויסר המלך את טבעתו אשר העביר מהמן ויתנה למרדכי ותשם
 אסתר את מרדכי על בית המן:
 3 ותוסק אסתר ותדבר לפני המלך ותפל לפני רגליו ותתחנן
 4 לו להעביר את רעת המן הגא'גי^ב: ויושט המלך לאסתר את שרפט
 ה הזהב ותקם אסתר ותעמד לפני המלך: ותאמר אם על המלך טוב
 ואם מצאתי חן לפניו וכשר הדבר לפני המלך וטובה אני בעיניו
 יפתח להשיב את הספרים אשר כתב לאבד את היהודים אשר
 6 בכל מדינות המלך: כי איככה אוכל וראיתי באב'ד'ן מולדתי:
 7 ויאמר המלך לאסתר המלכה ולמרדכי היהודי הנה בית המן
 8 נחתי לאסתר ואחו תלו על העץ^ב: ואתם פתבו על היהודים
 כשוב בעיניכם בשם המלך והתמו בטבעת המלך כי כתב אשר
 נכתב בשם המלך ונחת'ם בטבעת המלך אין להשיב:
 9 ויקראו ספרי המלך בעת ההיא בחדש השלישי (הוא חדש סיון)
 בשלושה ועשרים בו ויפתח ככל אשר צוה מרדכי על היהודים אל

(β) ה, 7 אחש'ר'ר"ש	(γ) ויאמר	(α) א, 8 אחש'ר'ר"ש
(β) 3 ואת מהשבתו אשר חשב על היהודים	(γ) ה, 8 מחשבת המן בן המרתא	
(δ) 6 איככה אוכל וראיתי ברעה אשר ימצא את עמי ו		[הגא'גי]
(ε) 7 אחש'ר'רש	(δ) על אשר שלח ידו ביהודיים	(η) 9 ו

6, 3 ויאמר המלך מה נעשה יקר וגדולה למרדכי על זה ויאמרו
4 נערי המלך משרתיו לא נעשה עמו דבר: ויאמר המלך מי בחצר
(והמין בא א'ל חצר בית המלך החיצונה לאמר למלך לחלות את
ה מרדכי על העץ אשר הכין לו): ויאמרו נערי המלך אליו הנה
המין עמד בחצר ויאמר המלך יבוא:

6 ויבוא המין ויאמר לו המלך מה לעשות באיש אשר המלך
חפץ ביקרו ויאמר המין בלבד למי יחפץ המלך לעשות יקר יותר
8, 7 ממי: ויאמר^ד אל המלך איש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו: יביאו
לבוש מלכות אשר לבש בו המלך וסוס אשר רכב עליו המלך {}:
9 ונתון הלבוש והסוס על יד איש משורי המלך הפרתמים והלבש^ה
את האיש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו {} והרכיבוהו על הסוס ברחוב
העיר וקרא^ה לפניו פכה יעשה לאיש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו:

י ויאמר המלך להמין מהר קח את הלבוש ואת הסוס כאשר
דברת ועשה כן למרדכי היהודי היושב בשער המלך אל תפל
דבר מכל אשר דברת: ויקח המין את הלבוש ואת הסוס וילבש
11 את מרדכי וירכיבוהו ברחוב העיר ויקרא לפניו פכה יעשה לאיש
אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו:

12 וישב מרדכי אל שער המלך והמין נדחק אל ביתו אבל וחפוי
13 ראש: ויספר^ה לזרש אשתו ולכל אהביו את כל אשר קרהו ויאמרו
לו חכמיו וזרש אשתו אם מזרע היהודים מרדכי אשר החלות לנפל
14 לפניו לא תוכל לו כי נפול תפול לפניו: עודם מדברים עמו וקריסי
המלך הגיעו ויבהלו להביא את המין אל המשתה אשר עשתה
אסתר:

א, 2, 7 ויבא המלך והמין לשחות עם אסתר המלכה: ויאמר המלך
לאסתר^ה במשתה היין מה שאלתך אסתר המלכה ותפתן לך ומה
3 בקשתך עד חצי המלכות ותעש: ותען אסתר המלכה ותאמר
אם מצאתי חן בעיניך המלך ואם על המלך טוב תפתן לי נפשי
4 בשאלתי ועמי בבקשתי: כי נמכרנו אני ועמי להשמיד להרוג
ולאבד ואלו לעבדים ולשפחות נמכרנו החרשתי כי אין הצר שוה
בנוק המלך:

(ד) 6, 7 המין 8 (ע) ויפתן כתר מלכות בראשו (ס) 13 המין 2, 7 גם ביום השני

א, 5 ויהי ביום השלישי ותלבש אסתר מלכות ותעמד בחצר בית המלך הפנימית נכה בית המלך והמלך יושב על כסא מלכותו
 2 בבית המלכות נכה פתח הבית: ויהי כראות המלך את אסתר המלכה עומדת בחצר נשאה חן בעיניו ויושט המלך לאסתר את שרביט הזהב אשר בידו ותקרב אסתר ותגע בראש השרביט: ויאמר לה המלך מה לך אסתר המלכה ומה בקשתך: עד חצי המלכות ויפתן לך: ותאמר אסתר אם על המלך טוב יבוא
 ה המלך והמן היום אל המשתה אשר עשיתי לו: ויאמר המלך מִהֲרוּ את המן לעשות את דבר אסתר ויבא המלך והמן אל המשתה אשר עשתה אסתר:

6 ויאמר המלך לאסתר במשתה היין מה שאלתך ויפתן לך ומה בקשתך: עד חצי המלכות ותעש: ותען אסתר ותאמר שאלתי
 8 ובקשתי: (אם מצאתי חן בעיני המלך ואם על המלך טוב לתת את שאלתי ולעשות את בקשתי) יבוא המלך והמן אל המשתה אשר אעשה להם ומהר אעשה כדבר המלך:

9 ויצא המן ביום ההוא שִׁמָּה וטוב לב וכראות המן את מרדכי בשער המלך ולא קם ולא זע מִיָּמֵנו וימלא^א על מרדכי חמה: ויחאפֶק^ב ויבוא אל ביתו וישלח ויבא את אהביו ואת זרש אשתו: ויספר להם^י את כבוד עשרו ורוב בניו ואת {{ אשר גדלו המלך ואת אשר נשאו על }} כלל^ז השרים ועבדי המלך: ויאמר^ד אך לא הביאה אסתר המלכה עם המלך אל המשתה אשר עשתה כי אם אותי וגם לבחר אני קרוא לה עם המלך: וכל זה איננו שוה לי בכל עת אשר אני ראה את מרדכי היהודי יושב בשער המלך:

14 ותאמר לו זרש אשתו וכל אהביו יעשו עִץ גְּבוֹה המשים אמה ובפקר אמר למלך ויתלו את מרדכי עליו ובא עם המלך אל המשתה שִׁמָּה וייטב הדבר לפני המן ויעש העץ:

א, 6 בלילה ההוא נדדה שנת המלך ויאמר להביא את ספר הזכרונות^א
 2 ויהיו נקראים לפני המלך: וימצא כתוב אשר הגיד מרדכי על גנתא וזרש שני סִרְסִי המלך^ב אשר בקשו לשלח יד במלך^י:

המן 12 (δ)

המן 11 (γ)

המן 5, ר (β)

המן 5, 9 (α)

אחשׁוּרִי"ש (γ)

משׁמְרִי הסֵפֶר 2 (β)

א, 6 דברי הימים (α)

- טו, 3 הרצים יצאו דחופים בדבר המלך והדת נתנה בשושן הבירה והמלך והמן ישבו לשחות והעיר שושן נבוכה:
- א, 4 ומרדכי ידע את כל אשר נעשה ויקרע את בגדיו וילבש שק ואפר ויצא בתוך העיר ויזעק זעקה גדולה ומרה: ויבוא עד לפני שער המלך (כי אין לבוא אל שער המלך בלבוש שק): ובכל מדינה ומדינה מקום אשר דבר המלך ודתו מגיע אבל גדול ליהודים וצום ובכי ומספד שק ואפר וצע לרבים:
- 4 ותבואינה נערות אסתר וסריסה ויגידו לה ותתחלחל המלכה מאד ותשלח בגדים להלביש את מרדכי ולהסיר שקו מעליו ולא קבל: ותקרא אסתר להתקף מסריסי המלך אשר העמיד לפניה ותצוהו אל מרדכי לדעת מה זה ועל מה זה: ויצא התקף אל מרדכי אל החוב העיר אשר לפני שער המלך: ויגד לו מרדכי את כל אשר קרהו ואת פרשת הכסף אשר אמר המן לשקול אל גנזי המלך ביהודיים לאבדם: ואת פתשגן כתב הדת אשר נתן בשושן להשמידם נתן לו להראות את אסתר ולהגיד לה ולצוות עליה לבוא אל המלך להתחנן לו ולבקש מלפניו על עמה: ויבוא התקף ויגד לאסתר את דברי מרדכי:
- י, 11 ותאמר אסתר להתקף ותצוהו אל מרדכי: כל עבדי המלך ועם מדינות המלך ידעים אשר כל איש ואשה אשר יבוא אל המלך אל החצר הפנימית אשר לא יקרא אחת דתו להמית לבד מאשר יושיט לו המלך את שרביט הזהב והיה ואני לא נקראתי לבוא אל המלך זה שלושים יום:
- 12, 13 ויג'ד" למרדכי את דברי אסתר: ויאמר מרדכי להשיב אל אסתר אל תדמי בנפשך להמלט בבית המלך מכל היהודים: כי אם ההרש תהריש בעת הזאת יר'ח והצלה יעמוד ליהודים ממקום אחר ואף ובית אביך תאבדו ומי יודע אם לעת כזאת הגעת למלכות:
- טו, 16 ותאמר אסתר להשיב אל מרדכי: לך כנוס את כל היהודים הנמצאים בשושן וצומו עלי ואל תאכלו ואל תשתו שלשת ימים לילה ויום גם אני ונערתי אצום כן ובכן אבוא אל המלך אשר לא כפת וכאשר אבדתי אבדתי:
- 17 ויעבר מרדכי ויעש ככל אשר צוהה עליו אסתר:

- א, 3 אחר הדברים האלה גדל המלך^א את המן [] וינשאתו וישם
 2 את כסאו מעל כל השרים אשר אתו: וכל עבדי המלך אשר
 בשער המלך פרעים ומשתחווים להמן כי כן צוה לו המלך ומרדכי
 3 לא יכרע ולא ישתחוה: ויאמרו עבדי המלך אשר בשער המלך
 4 למרדכי מדוע אתה עובר את מצות המלך: ויהי באמרם אליו
 יום ויום ולא שמיע אליהם ויגידו להמן לראות היעמדו דברי
 ה מרדכי:^ב וירא המן כי אין מרדכי פרע ומשתחוה לו וימלא
 6 חמה: ויבז בעיניו לשלח יד במרדכי לבדו {} ויבקש^ג להשמיד
 את כל[^ד] היהודים:{} אשר בכל מלכות אחשׁוֹרׁשׁ[^ה]:
 8 ויאמר המן למלך ״יִשְׁנֶה״ עם אחד מִפְּזֵר ומִפְּרֵד בין העמים
 בכל מדינות מלכותך ודחיהם שְׁנוֹת מכל עם ואת דתי המלך
 9 אינם עשים ולמלך אין שוה להפחם: אם על המלך טוב יכתב
 לֵאבֹדָם ועשרת אלפים כפר כסף אשקול על ידי עשי המלאכה
 י להביא אל גנזי המלך: ויסר המלך את טַפְעָתוֹ מעל ידו ויתנה
 11 להמן:^ו ויאמר המלך להמן^ז העם^ח נתון^ט לך, לעשות בו כשׁוב
 בעיניך:
 12 ויקראו ספרי המלך בחדש הראשון בשלושה עשר יום בו
 יופתב ככל אשר צוה המן אל אחשדרפני המלך ואל הפחות אשר
 על מדינה ומדינה ואל שרי עם ועם מדינה ומדינה ככתבה ועם
 13 ועם כלשונו בשם המלך״ נכתב ונחתם בטפעת המלך: ונשלוח
 ספרים ביד הרצים אל כל מדינות המלך להשמיד להרג ולֵאבֹד
 את כל היהודים מפער ועד זֶקֶן טָף ונשים ביום אחד בשלושה
 14 עשר לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר^י) ושללם לבז: פתשגן
 הכתב (להנתן דת בכל מדינה ומדינה) גלוי לכל העמים להיות
 עֲתִידִים ליום הזה:

(א) א, 3 אחשׁוֹרׁשׁ (ב) 4 כי הגיד להם אשר הוא יהודי (ג) ה, 3 המן
 (ד) 6 המן (ε) עם מרדכי (ז) כי הגידו לו את עם מרדכי (ח) 8 אחשׁוֹרׁשׁ
 (θ) י בן המדתא ה'גא'גי צרר היהודים (י) 11 ויִהְיֶה כסס (כ) 12 אחשׁוֹרׁשׁ
 (λ) 7 בחדש הראשון (הוא חדש ניסן) בשנת שתיים עשרה למלך μ הפיל
 פור (הוא הגורל) לפני המן מיום ליום ומחדש 'לחדש ויפל הגורל
 על שלושה עשר' לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר):

- 2 ואת שבע הנערות הראיות {} וישנה ואת נערותיה לשוב בית
 י הנשים: (לא הגידה אסתר את עמה ואת מולדתה כי מרדכי צוה
 11 עליה אשר לא תגיד) ובכל יום ויום מרדכי מתהלך לפני חצר
 בית הנשים לדעת את שלום אסתר ומה יעשה בה:
 12 ובהגיע תר נערה ונערה לבוא אל המלך^ז מקץ היות לה כדת
 הנשים שנים עשר חדש (כי כן ימלאו ימי מרוקיהן ששה חדשים
 13 בשמן המר וששה חדשים בבשמים ובתמרוקי הנשים): וזוה
 הנערה באה אל המלך את כל אשר תאמר יפתן לה לבוא עמה
 14 מבית הנשים עד בית המלך: בערב היא באה ובפקר היא שבה
 אל בית הנשים^ח (אל יד שַׁעֲשֻׁנֹז סריס המלך שמר הפילגשים) לא
 תבוא עוד אל המלך כי אם חֲפִץ בה המלך ונקראה בשם:
 טו ובהגיע תר אסתר^ט לבוא אל המלך לא בקשה דבר כי אם
 את אשר יאמר הַגִּי שְׁמֵר הנשים ותהי נשואת חן בעיני כל
 16 ראיָה: ותלקח^א אל המלך^א אל בית מלכותו בהוש העשירי (הוא
 17 חדש טבת) בשנת שבע למלכותו: ויאהב המלך את אסתר מכל
 הנשים ותשֹׂא חן וחסד לפניו מכל הבתולות וישם כתר מלכות
 18 בראשה וימליכה תחת ושתי: ויעש המלך משתה גדול לכל שריו
 ועבדיו^ב והנחה למדינות^ג ויתן משׁאֵת ליד המלך:
 21 בימים ההם ומרדכי יושב בשער המלך^ד קצק בַּגְּתָן ותָרַשׁ שני
 22 סְרִיסֵי המלך {} ויבקשו לשלח יד במלך^ה: ויָדַע הדבר למרדכי
 23 ויָפֵד^ו לַחֲמֵן [בן המֶדְתָּא הַגְּאֹנִי] מִשְׁמֵרֵי הַסֵּף: ויבקש הדבר
 וימצא ויתלו שניהם על עץ ויפתב בספר דברי הימים לפני המלך
 והמלך לא ידע כי מרדכי הגיד לחמן:

2, 12 (ז) אחשׁוֹרִי־ר׳שׁ (ז) 14 שני (θ) טו, 2 בת אביחיל דוד מרדכי אשר לקח לו לבת
 טו (ε) סריס המלך (κ) אסתר 16 (λ) אסתר (μ) אחשׁוֹרִי־ר׳שׁ
 18 (ν) את משתה אסתר (ε) עשה (ο) א, 10 וישם המלך^ז מס על הארץ ואיי הים
 19 (π) ובהקבץ בתולות^ט ומרדכי יושב בשער המלך: 21 (ρ) אחשׁוֹרִי־רש
 22 (σ) לאסתר המלכה ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מרדכי φφ

(ττ) א, 10 אחשׁוֹרִי־רש (υυ) 2, 19 שנית

(φφ) כ, 2 אין אסתר מִגֶּדֶת מולדתה ואת עמה כאשר צוה עליה מרדכי
 ואת מאמר מרדכי אסתר עשה כאשר היתה באִמְנָה אתו:

1, 16 ויאמר מ'מ'ז'כן לפני המלך והשרים לא על המלך לבדו עושה
 ושתי המלכה כי על כל השרים ועל כל העמים אשר בכל מדינות
 17 המלך: כי יצא דבר המלכה 'אל כל הנשים לחבזות בעליהן
 בעיניהן באמרם המלך[§] אמר להביא את ושתי המלכה לפניו
 18 ולא באה: והיום הזה תאמרנה שרות פרס ומדי[¶] לכל שרי המלך
 19 ו'ב'די בזיון וקצף: אם על המלך טוב יצא דבר מלכות מפניו
 ויפתב בדתי פרס ומדי ולא יעבור אשר לא תבוא ושתי לפני
 כ המלך ומלכותה יתן המלך לרעותה הטובה ממנה: ונשמע פתגם
 המלך (אשר יעשה בכל מלכותו כי רבה היא) וכל הנשים יתנו
 יקר לבעליהן למפדול ועד קטן:
 21 ויישב הדבר בעיני המלך והשרים ויעש המלך כדבר ממוכן:
 22 וישלח ספרים אל כל מדינות המלך אל מדינה ומדינה ככתבה
 ואל עם ועם כלשונו להיות כל איש שׂיר בביתו[¶]:

2, א אחר הדברים האלה כשׁך חמת המלך[¶] זכר את ושתי ואת אשר
 2 עשתה ואת אשר נגזר עליה: ויאמרו נערי המלך משׂרתיו יבִקְשׁוּ
 3 למלך נערות בתולות טובות מראה: ויפקד המלך פקידים בכל
 מדינות מלכותו ויקבצו את כל נערה בתולה טובת מראה אל
 4 שושן הבירה[¶]: והנערה אשר תיטב בעיני המלך תמלך תחת
 ושתי ויישב הדבר בעיני המלך ויעש כן:
 ה איש יהודי היה בשושן הבירה ושימו מרדכי (בן יאיר בן שִׁמְעִי
 6 בן קיש)[¶] איש ימיני אשר הגלה מירושלים עם הגולה אשר
 7 הגלה נבוכדנצר מלך בבל: ויהי אמן את הדסה (היא אֶסְתֵּר)
 בת דוד כי אין לה אב ואם והנערה יפת תואר וטובת מראה ובמות
 8 אביה ואמה לקחה מרדכי לו לבת: ויהי בהשמיע דבר המלך
 ודתו ובהקבץ נערות רבות אל שושן הבירה[¶] ותלקח אל בית
 9 המלך אל יד הגי' שמר הנשים: ותיטב הנערה בעיניו ותשוא הסד
 לפניו ויבהל את תמרוקיה ואת מנותה לתת לה {מבית המלך}

(ν) 1, 16 אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ (ξ) 17 אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ (ο) 18 אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ שְׁמִיעוּ אֶת דְּבַר הַמֶּלֶכָה
 (π) 19 אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ (ρ) 22 וּמִדְּבַר יְבִלְשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ (α) 2, א אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ
 (β) 2, 3 אֶל בֵּית הַנָּשִׁים אֶל יַד הַגִּי' סָרִיס הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁמֵר הַנָּשִׁים וְנִתְּחַן תַּמְרוּקִיָּהָן
 (γ) 6 אֶחָשֶׁר־רִשׁ אֶת יְכִיָּה מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה (δ) 8 אֶל יַד הַגִּי' (ε) אֶסְתֵּר

מגלת אסתר

- א 1 ויהי בימי אחשׁוֹרִישׁ (הוא) המלך מהדו ועד כוש שבע ועשרים
 2 ומאה (מדינה): ^ב כשבת המלך^י על כסא מלכותו אשר בשושן הבירה:
 3 בשנת שלוש למלכו עשה משתה לכל שריו ועבדיו ושרי חיל פרס
 4 ומדי הפרתמים ושרי המדינות לפניו: בהראתו את עשר כבוד
 מלכותו ואת יקר תפארת גדולתו ^ג שמונים ומאת יום:
 ה ובמל'אות הימים האלה עשה המלך לכל העם הנמצאים בשושן
 הבירה למגדול ועד קטן משׁוֹתָה שבעת ימים בחצר גנת ביִתְן
 6 המלך: 'תחת' כרפסִסִּי אחוז בחבלי 'תכלת' וארגמן על גלילי
 כסף ועמודי שש ב'משות זזהב וכסף על רצפת פֶּהט ושש ודר
 7 וסִחֶרֶת: והשקות בכלי זהב וכלים מפֶּלִים שונים ויין מלכות רב
 8 כיד המלך: והשתיה כֶּתֶת אֵין אִנס כי כן יסד המלך על כל רב
 9 ביתו לעשות כרצון איש ואיש: גם ושתי המלכה עשתה משתה
 נשים 'בבית המלכות':
 י ביום השביעי כטוב לב המלך ביין אמר למְהוּמָן בָּזְחָא חֲרִבֹנָא
 בְּגָתָנָא^ה 'תִּרְשִׁי' זֶתֶר וְכִרְפִּס שבעת הַפְּרִיסִים המְשֻׁרְתִּים את פני
 11 המלך: להביא את ושתי המלכה לפני המלך בכתר מלכות
 12 להראות העמים והשרים את יפיה כי טובת מראה היא: ותִּמְאָן
 המלכה לבוא בדבר המלך אשר ביד הַפְּרִיסִים ויקצץ המלך
 13 מאד וחמתו בערה בו: ויאמר המלך לחכמים ידעי העתים (כי כן
 14 דבר המלך לפני כל ידעי דת ודין: וְהִקְרַב אליו פֶּרְשָׁנָא שִׁתֶּר
 אֲדָמְתָא תִּרְשִׁישׁ מֶרֶס מִרְסָנָא מְמוּכָן שבעת שרי פרס ומדי ראי
 טו פני המלך הישבים ראשונה במלכות | כדת?) מה לעשות במלכה^י
 על אשר לא עשתה את מאמר המלך " ביד הַפְּרִיסִים:

(א) 1, אחשׁוֹרִישׁ (β) 2 בימים ההם (γ) אחשׁוֹרִישׁ (δ) 4 ימים רבים
 (ε) 6 חור (ζ) ברץ (η) 9 אשר למלך σσ (θ) י, 1 ואבְנֶתָא (ι) אחשׁוֹרִישׁ
 (κ) 12 ושתי (λ) טו, 1 ושתי (μ) אחשׁוֹרִישׁ

CRITICAL NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT
PASSAGES

JULIUS A. BEWER

CRITICAL NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES

JULIUS A. BEWER

1. OBADIAH, Vs. 16.

The most natural and reasonable interpretation of the drinking on Mount Zion is the one that refers it to the drinking of the cup of Yahweh's fury (cf. Jer., chap. 25; 49:12). Since this is now the prevalent interpretation we need not again adduce the arguments for it. There is only one point in connection with it that is strange, namely, that the nations are doomed to drink *continually* (תָּמִיד), for it is manifestly impossible for them to go on drinking after they have become "as though they had not been." The force of this observation has long been felt, and two ways out of the difficulty have been suggested:

1) The reading of many Hebrew manuscripts, which have סָבִיב in place of תָּמִיד, was accepted by many scholars, from De Rossi on, as the original. But the arguments brought forward against it were so conclusive that the latest commentators, Nowack and Marti, do not even think the variant reading important enough to mention it.¹

2) The reading of the Greek version (A B C Q), *οἶνον . . . πίνονται*, Hexaplar Syriac *ܡܚܝܬܐ*, has been regarded by many as representing the original. *Oἶνον*, which stands in the place of תָּמִיד, is supposed to be the translation of an original הָמַר (cf. Deut. 32:14) or of הַמָּד which occurs in New Hebrew in this meaning. Which of these two synonyms should be substituted for תָּמִיד is still the question. This suggestion has the advantage of easily explaining the reading תָּמִיד, and has again been taken up by Marti, and by Nowack in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. But it does not explain how the other reading סָבִיב for תָּמִיד originated, and, moreover, it is not really in harmony with the

¹ Nowack in his *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, "Die Kleinen Propheten" (1897, 21905). Marti in his *Kurzer Hand-Commentar*, "Dodekapropheton" (1903). In his edition of the text of Obadiah in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (1906) Nowack had, of course, to mention the variant reading in the textual notes.

interpretation that the drinking refers to the drinking of the cup of fury of Yahweh, for if **הַחֶמֶר** or **הַחֶמֶר** originally stood here, the other interpretation, which refers it to reveling and banqueting in connection with the celebration of the victory over the holy city Jerusalem, seems to be more natural, but against this the whole context protests. It is not the drinking of wine but of fury that must be referred to. In none of the passages where the drinking of the cup of judgment is spoken of do we find this expressed merely by "they shall drink *wine*," not to lay stress on the fact that **הַחֶמֶר** is never used in such connections. It would be much more reasonable to regard **הַחֶמֶר** as a corruption of **הַחֶמֶר**, "they shall drink *my fury*," for such a phrase would indeed express the idea that must be in the original text; cf. Job 21:20, **מִהַחֶמֶת שְׁדֵי יְשׁוּתָהּ**. I do not know whether this has ever been suggested. It would at least be plausible, and would fit in admirably with the context. But it is not easy to explain how **הַחֶמֶר** was misread as **סָבִיב**, though it is not difficult to see how **הַחֶמֶר** might have arisen from a badly written **הַחֶמֶר**. The reading **סָבִיב** is, however, attested by too many manuscripts to be left altogether out of account. We must therefore seek for a different explanation.

There are three readings: (1) MT **הַחֶמֶר**; (2) many Hebrew manuscripts, **סָבִיב**; (3) **Ⲭⲁⲩⲥⲏⲩ** Syr. Hex. *oivos*. The key to the solution of the difficulty lies in the recognition of the fact that *oivos* represents not **הַחֶמֶר** (Deut. 32:14) but **סָבִיב**, which is translated by *oivos* in Isa. 1:22. It so happens that **הַחֶמֶר** occurs only once, in Deut. 32:14, where the Greek has *oivos*—the only other occurrence, Isa. 27:2, is due to a corruption—and that **סָבִיב** also occurs only once, in Isa. 1:22, the other two occurrences, Hos. 4:18, Nah. 1:10, being due to textual error. (See on both nouns Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*.) Thus, there is just as much reason for regarding **סָבִיב** as underlying *oivos* as for thinking that **הַחֶמֶר** was the Hebrew original of **Ⲭⲁⲩⲥⲏⲩ** Syr. Hex. The correctness of the restoration of **סָבִיב** will at once appear.

This **סָבִיב** sides with the reading of the Hebrew MSS, **סָבִיב**. It is easy to see how the one could be mistaken for the other. But it would be a mistake, now that we have discovered how the

reading סָבִיב originated, to think that we have also discovered the original Hebrew text, and that it is necessary merely to substitute סָבִיב for תָּמִיד; for the objection urged above against the reading הָמָר or תָּמָר holds also against סָבִיב, which is merely a synonym of הָמָר, and, moreover, it would not explain how תָּמִיד could have arisen. And תָּמִיד also is too well attested to be simply set aside.

Both words תָּמִיד and סָבִיב must have originally stood in the text — סָבִיב־תָּמִיד. Now in the passages which deal with the drinking of the cup of Yahweh's fury a usual phrase is, שָׁתָה מִיַּד יְהוָה; cf. Isa. 51:17, אֲשֶׁר שָׁתִית מִיַּד יְהוָה אֶת־כּוֹס הַחַמָּה; the cup is in Yahweh's hand, Jer. 25:15, 17, קַח אֶת־כּוֹס מִיָּדִי . . . ; Hab. 2:16. In the last three consonants of תָּמִיד we must originally have had מִיַּד or מִיָּדִי. When this is recognized it will at once be seen that in סָבִיב we have originally פֶּס, and that the א belongs with the ת of תָּמִיד as the sign of the accusative, thus:

סב את מיד
כס את מיד
אֶת־כּוֹס מִיָּדִי

This is exactly what we need in our text, which now reads:

For as ye have drunk
Upon my holy mountain,
So shall all the nations drink
The cup at my hand;
And they shall drink and swallow down,
And be as though they had not been.

It will be noted that in the parallel passage, Jer. 49:12, we have the phrase לְשָׁתוֹת הַכּוֹס, which is a weighty argument in favor of our restoration. As is well known, this verse in Obadiah belongs to the later portions. The phrase "to drink the cup of fury at the hand of Yahweh," is so well known that it is not necessary to add an explanation regarding the contents of the cup, though this was done when the phrase was first used, Jer., chap. 25, Isa., chap. 51. But in Hab. 2:16 we have it called simply כּוֹס יְמִין יְהוָה; in Jer. 49:12 still more simply, הַכּוֹס, the well-known cup of fury. And we should perhaps have expected אֶת־הַכּוֹס with the article in Obadiah also, were it not for the fact

that in another passage *against Edom*, Lam. 4:21, we have simply כּוֹס without any qualifying element, and yet every one recognizes that it can be nothing else but the cup of Yahweh's fury, גַּם-עַלֶּיךָ תִּעְבֶּר-כּוֹס תִּשְׁכָּרִי וְתִחַצְרִי. In our passage we have the qualifying מִיָּדִי, which places it beyond doubt that the cup of wrath of Yahweh is intended. We may add that the verse is also metrically better when restored as above.

The following conjecture may serve to explain how it came about that the one set of texts has one part and the other set another part of the reading. An early copyist accidentally omitted אַחֲרַפֶּס, and wrote it between הַגּוֹיִם and מִיָּדִי for lack of space in the following manner:

א ת מִיָּד	הַגּוֹיִם	or	ט נ ת מִיָּד	א הַגּוֹיִם
------------------	-----------	----	-----------------------	----------------

The י at the end was probably not written. Then one scribe, regarding א, כ, ט as not belonging to the text, copied merely הַגּוֹיִם תְּמִיד; another scribe thinking that א, כ, ט were put in as a correction, and therefore the better text, copied merely הַגּוֹיִם סָבָא. But he took כ for ב, which was one of the easiest things to do, and read the whole as הַגּוֹיִם סָבָא, which seemed to him to fit in admirably with שָׂתָה, but which another read as הַגּוֹיִם סָבִיב. It is interesting to notice that he read the consonants in the other direction, not אבס but סבא, which indicates

that a word written אבס might be read either סבא or אבס, since there was apparently no rule for writing up or down in such cases. Possibly this may explain a number of textual mistakes where the various consonants have been transposed.

The confusion arose before the LXX translation was made, at a time when the square alphabet was used, or a form of the alphabet approximating it very closely. The passage belongs to a Maccabean writer, as I shall try to make probable in another place.

2. JUDGES 2:1a, 5b

וַיַּעַל מִלֶּאֱדָיִהוּדָה בְּיַהֲגֵלְגַל אֶל־הַבְּכִים
וַיִּבְחֹר־שָׁם לַיהוָה

These verses follow the story of the invasion of Canaan by the various tribes as summarized in the first chapter, and are usually interpreted as follows: "Israel being now firmly established in Canaan, the religious center is transferred from the plains of Jericho, where they first gained a foothold in Western Palestine, to a sanctuary in the heart of the land. This change is signalized by the removal of the Angel of Yahweh, his presence manifested in oracle and theophany, from Gilgal to the new holy place, which, upon his appearance there, is consecrated by sacrifice (vs. 5b). The transfer of the religious center to Bethel marks the end of the period of invasion, as the preceding period of migration ended with the encampment at Gilgal (Jos. 5:10-12)."²

It is assumed here that vs. 1a and vs. 5b go together, and are not from the redactor who wrote vss. 1b-5a, but part of an old source;³ and further that הַבְּכִים cannot be original in vs. 1, for "we expect . . . the older name of the place and a name of greater note."⁴

These assumptions appear to be altogether correct. But it is now further declared that the source from which these verses are taken must be J, from which we have also chap. 1, and that the original name of Bochim was in all probability *Bethel*, which is gathered from the conflate reading of Θ, ἐπὶ τὸν Κλαυθμῶνα καὶ ἐπὶ Βαυθῆλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ. Both of these points seem to the present writer very unlikely. According to chap. 1, which is from J, the various tribes have gone up into the hill-country and have separated. They are now regarded as being in their own territories, where they have settled down after a more or less successful fight. This is clearly the representation of the first

² G. F. Moore, *International Critical Commentary*, "Judges" (1895), pp. 56 f.

³ Moore, *ibid.*, p. 57: "What stands between (vss. 1b-5a) is in substance and form strikingly different from chap. 1, and bears the stamp of the school of Hebrew historiography which, for lack of a more suitable general name, we call Deuteronomic."

⁴ Moore, p. 58.

chapter. But if this is so, then it is strange that the Angel of Yahweh is, in chap. 2:1, still at Gilgal, i. e., in the old camp where the tribes were together before they separated. We should have expected that he would go up with them into the various parts of Canaan, but instead of this we find him still in the plains of Jericho. Why should this be so? Did this writer think that the Israelites could fight their battles without the help of Yahweh, whose representative or manifestation the Angel is? Certainly not, for both in 1:19 and in 1:22 he says distinctly, "Yahweh was with Judah," and "Yahweh was with them," i. e., the house of Joseph. A writer who had this conception that Yahweh Himself was going with the invading armies can hardly have thought that the Angel of Yahweh remained behind at Gilgal, for how could the people tell that Yahweh was with them, if they saw that the Angel of Yahweh stayed at Gilgal? Budde says: "The Angel of Yahweh did not follow the march of Judah but that of the house of Joseph (vs. 22). That would be the meaning. And this would have a good reason, since Judah regained in the far South its contact with Yahweh Himself in His seat."⁵

Now, as a matter of fact, the Angel of Yahweh always went *before* Israel and did not stay behind. Ex. 23:20, 23; 32:34; 33:2, are explicit on this point. It is promised there that the Angel should lead Israel into Canaan and help them gain possession of the land, and not that he should stay at a given place where the religious center, i. e., the camp, would be, and let the armies march away from him. He is to be the victorious leader of Israel's invading army. If then we find him in 2:1 still at Gilgal, it means either that he has not yet gone up into the hill country, or that he has returned to the camp at Gilgal after his expedition. Neither conception is in harmony with the representation of chap. 1. And 2:1a cannot come from the same writer as chap. 1. The writer of chap. 1 does not speak of the Angel of Yahweh at all; he speaks of Yahweh Himself. This is in line with the results of the investigations of the sources of the Hexateuch, for chap. 1 is admittedly from J. But in the

⁵ *Das Buch der Richter* (1897), p. 18. Similarly Nowack.

Hexateuch it is not J who has the conception of the Angel of Yahweh, but E and R'¹⁵. Chap. 2:1a is therefore not from J but from E.

If this is recognized the main difficulty is removed, for it is seen at once that this verse is really entirely in line with the representation of E. For E regards the camp at Gilgal as fixed, and lets Joshua return to the camp at Gilgal with his army after the great decisive battles (cf. Josh. 10:15, 43), and of course the Angel of Yahweh who, according to E in Exodus, is to go before Israel, is with the army. So also here. The army is in camp at Gilgal after having won the victories over the Canaanites, and now the Angel of Yahweh leads them on into the hill country. The camp, which is the religious center, is removed from Gilgal to a place in the interior of the country.

Unfortunately the name of the place whither he leads them is uncertain, for the reading **הַבְּנִים** is, as is generally acknowledged, corrupt. The conflate reading of **ט** gives no satisfaction either. But we shall find a fruitful suggestion in the fact that the verse belongs to E. The religious center is transferred, according to E, from Gilgal to Shechem. According to E in Josh., chap. 24, with which Judg., chap. 2 is connected, Joshua has the Israelites gathered at Shechem, and it is on Mount Ebal, near Shechem, that they sacrifice, according to Josh. 8:30, 31 (E). According to Judg. 2:6 (E, = Josh. 24:28) also, the Israelites are at Shechem. And so it seems to the present writer exceedingly probable that the original reading in 2:5 was **שֶׁכֶּם** in place of **הַבְּנִים**, a reading which graphically also corresponds better to the Massoretic text than **בִּיתֶחֱלָל** of **ט**. The reading of **ט** appears to be nothing more than a conjecture, which may have been due to the fact that there was an 'Allon Bacuth near Bethel (Gen. 35:8).⁶ But that Bethel was the religious center after Gilgal we are told nowhere else. That Shechem was so is in harmony with the narrative of E in the book of Joshua.⁷

⁶ Or it may have been due to chap. 1:22, where the house of Joseph goes to Bethel from Gilgal.

⁷ The corruption of **שֶׁכֶּם** into **הַבְּנִים** not only preceded the Greek translation but is older than the interpolated verses 1b-5a, which explain the name. This must also be assumed on the other theory; and it argues strongly against the originality of **בִּיתֶחֱלָל** in

Moreover, on this hypothesis the relation of 2:1*a*, 5*b* to the following description from E of the death of Joshua, vss. 6 ff., becomes clear. Chap. 2:1*a*, 5*b*, are not the conclusion of chap. 1, but form, with vss. 6 ff., a parallel to Josh. 24. Chap. 1 is a summary of the conquest of Canaan from the document J, and was prefixed to the book of Judges when it was made a book by itself; chap. 2 has nothing to do with this, but is from E—of course, only the verses that have been discussed are meant; for our purpose it is not necessary to go into an analysis of the whole of chap. 2. Verses 1*a*, 5*b*, take up the narrative of the settlement in Canaan according to E, not of the conquest. The army has gone back to its camp at Gilgal, and from there they move their camp to Shechem (vs. 1*a*). At Shechem a sacrifice is offered, and Shechem becomes the new religious center (vs. 5*b*). Then Joshua sends the various tribes into the territories which had been assigned them by lot (vs. 6). Verse 6 also assumes that all the tribes are still together; but they are not sent away, as in chap. 1:1 ff., to conquer the land—that had been done before—but simply to take possession of their allotted sections. Then follows the death and burial of Joshua, and the redactional summary of Israel's faithfulness during Joshua's lifetime and its unfaithfulness after his death. This is succeeded by the summary of the period of the Judges.

3. ISAIAH 42:5-9

The long, formal, introduction shows that vss. 5-9 do not belong to the Servant of Yahweh poem, 42:1-4. The passage must be taken with 41:21-29, of which it is the logical continua-

vs. 1. For when vss. 1*b*-5*a* were added, the reading in 1*a* must already have been **הבנים**. Bethel is therefore nothing else but an old explanatory gloss and does not represent the original text.

It is also to be noted that **6** read not simply *ἐπὶ τὸν Κλανθμῶνα καὶ ἐπὶ Βαιθὴλ* but added *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ*. Moore thinks that this is merely due to dittography of **ביתחאל**, while Budde and Nowack regard it as a correction of a more original **בית יוסה**, and adopt the latter as an original element of the text, which according to them was: "And the Angel of Jahve led 'the house of Joseph' from Gilgal to 'Bethel.'" That **בית ישראל** corresponds here to **בית יוסה** is clear, for the Judaeans do not go to Bethel. But it is not an original part of the text, but another marginal note, which explained that the Angel of Yahweh went with the Joseph tribes, according to chap. 1:22; *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ* is thus a gloss upon a gloss. Note also the peculiar grammatical construction in the Greek, which gives no sense and shows its secondary character. At best it might be supposed that **אל בית ישראל** stood originally after **וראמר**, "and he said to the house of Israel."

tion. Verses 5 f. are addressed not to the Servant of Yahweh but to Cyrus; they expand the thought of 41:25; verses 7-9 expand 41:26-29. In this way everything has its true, natural force.

The terms employed in the address correspond precisely to those used in chap. 45 with reference to Cyrus:

אֲשֶׁר־יַחְזֹקְתִּי בְיָמָיו = יַחְזֹק בְּיָדָהּ 45:1
הַעֲרֹתָהּ בְּצֶדֶק = קָרָאתִיהָ בְּצֶדֶק 45:13

Compare also קָרָאתִיו 48:15.

Yahweh declares the purpose which he has in view with Cyrus. Cyrus is to set the captives free. The introduction, vs. 5, sums up the claims that have been made for Yahweh in the previous chapters, and forms an admirable backing for the work of Cyrus. The Almighty God, the creator of the world and of men, stands behind him in his undertaking. Omnipotence guarantees its complete success. The emphasis on "I, Yahweh," is at once clear when we remember the debate of chap. 41. Yahweh has called him, and no one else; for it is he who directs the affairs of the world. Yahweh watches over him and protects him (נָצַר); "unharméd" he goes from battle to battle (41:3), his life is charmed because it is in Yahweh's keeping. All this is plain, and stands out very clearly when applied to Cyrus. But now we come to the difficult לְבָרִית עִם. Before we determine its meaning we should observe that the following phrase לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים is not an original element of the text. The reasons for this assertion are, first, that it is missing in \mathfrak{S}^B , and therefore rightly omitted in Swete's edition; one cannot explain its omission, but very well its addition; second, it is missing in 49:8, where our passage is evidently quoted,⁸ and where there would be no reason for its omission, on the contrary every reason for its addition if it had already been in the text of 42:6; for it would be strange indeed if it had been there and yet had been omitted, when in the following verse he speaks to *those who are in darkness*. It was thus not yet in the Hebrew text of the LXX, and it was not yet in the Hebrew text of the interpolator of 49:8b a. It was intro-

⁸ Duhm, Marti.

duced into our passage by one who regarded the verses as addressed to the Servant of Yahweh, and in fact, he took the phrase from one of the Servant of Yahweh songs, 49:6.

With the recognition of this interpolation, one of the difficulties in determining the meaning of לְבִרִיתָ עִם is eliminated. It is clear from vs. 7, which defines Yahweh's purpose, that עִם must refer to Yahweh's people Israel. Moreover, it seems to the present writer that Duhm is quite right when he declares that the phrase has not been correctly preserved, and also that Duhm's proposal to read לְבִרְכָּתָ עִם for לְבִרִיתָ עִם should be adopted. The change is exceedingly slight, merely כ for י. It is exactly what we expect in connection with the following.⁹ Verse 7 follows quite naturally. It expresses the manner in which Cyrus shall be a blessing to the people: He shall "open blind eyes, bring out captives from the prison, and those who sit in darkness from the house of restraint." Cyrus shall be the agent of Yahweh in the restoration of his exiled people. The phrases do not fit the Servant of Yahweh, but are altogether appropriate in connection with Cyrus. And exactly in line with this is the conclusion in vss. 8 f., which looks back to the great argument of chap. 41: I, Yahweh, that is my name; I, not the idols, have done this. To Yahweh all the glory is due. He had prophesied things in the past; these prophecies had come true. Now he foretells something new that will also certainly come to pass, the release and restoration of Israel.

Taken thus the whole passage can, and must, be regarded as genuine, and is not to be given up as secondary with Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti.

4. JEREMIAH 2:34

The second half of this verse is difficult. The latest commentator of Jeremiah, Cornill, does not translate it. If one looks over the many suggestions that have been made, it may be said that today there are two that commend themselves to many scholars. The one translates, "Not in the act of breaking

⁹ The phrase לְבִרִיתָ עִם was already read by the LXX and by the interpolator of 49:8, so the corruption must be very old. It, also, is due to the fact that these verses were taken as referring to the Servant of Yahweh.

in didst thou find them," i. e., those whom thou hast slain were not detected in crime. Thus Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*, s. v. מִתְחַפֵּי ; so already the Syriac version, the Targum, Hitzig, Graf, *et al.* The passage is then compared with Exod. 22:1, according to which such killing would be justified. This is not without difficulty, for if the murdered people are innocent, it is rather strange that we should be assured that they were not killed in the act of breaking in. But especially difficult, on this interpretation, is the following clause; עַל כָּל־אֵלֶּה could then only mean "but on account of all these," i. e. the aforementioned evil practices of nature-worship. And one might think of prophets and true Yahweh worshipers who were killed by them because of their protest against the wickedness of the people.

The other interpretation is that of Duhm, which Cornill regards as the most acceptable so far proposed. Duhm takes מִתְחַפֵּי concretely as "burglars," instead of abstractly as "burglary," and translates, "Not with burglars have I found it, but upon all these;" with "these" he points at certain well-known people. The "it" refers to דָּם, which must be read for דָּם in the first half of the verse. In this Duhm rightly follows G and Giesebrecht. The reference of the whole clause would be to the human sacrifices which were offered in connection with the nature-worship which the people practiced so zealously. The difficulty with this view is that a burglar is not a type for a murderer; for one does not as a rule find blood on burglars, and this would be required here: Not with burglars—where of course everybody expects to find blood—have I found it, but upon all these! Moreover, the difference in the prepositions, בְּ with מִתְחַפֵּי and עַל with כָּל־אֵלֶּה, is inexplicable. So already Cornill. Nevertheless Duhm is in the main on the right track. That the reference cannot be to judicial murders is quite clear from the following, where the people are confident that Yahweh's wrath shall turn away from them, because they believe themselves guiltless (vs. 35). It must be connected with the religious practices.

The solution of the difficulties in this verse is in a slight emendation of the text. We should probably read בַּמִּסְתָּרִים for

במחותר.¹⁰ The translation would be: "Not in hidden places have I found it (the blood), but upon all these." The antithesis is simple and natural. The murders have not been committed in secret, but openly; and the people declare in addition that they have brought no guilt on themselves thereby. Openly they carry the very traces of their crimes, of the sacrifices of children and slaves; they are not ashamed of them or afraid because of them; they think, on the contrary, that they have deserved mercy and forgiveness on account of them. Compare Mic., chap. 6. The people have the brazen forehead of a harlot, and refuse to be ashamed (3:3). A reading of the second and third chapters will show that this is entirely in line with the argument of the prophet. The change is simple and slight and the meaning that we get is exactly what is needed in this verse. It is significant that both Luther and A.V. instinctively felt this. Luther translated "und ist nicht heimlich, sondern offenbar an denselbigen Orten" and A.V. (also R.V. margin), "I have not found it by secret search but upon all these."¹¹

5. PSALM 32:2

Professor Briggs, in his commentary on the Psalms, has proved conclusively that the clause וַאֲיֵן בְּרוּחוֹ רְמִיָּה introduces "a disturbing thought." As long as the poet refrained from confessing his sins he was in misfortune and sickness as the result of his sin. The sickness had been sent by God as a means of discipline; it should bring the sufferer to a confession of his sins. But he was obstinate, and as a result the hand of God rested very heavily upon him until it finally brought him to penitence and confession. When he had confessed he experienced at once God's forgiving grace. Of this he tells us in his psalm. It is evident that "the poet does not regard deceit, but the obstinate refusal to confess his sin, as the obstacle to the forgiveness of sins and the removal of misfortune" (Duhm). But may it not be possible that the poet wrote מֵר and not רְמִיָּה, "and in whose

¹⁰ One is tempted to suggest בְּמִסְתָּרָה, but the feminine form does not occur in biblical or later Hebrew. This would require the change of but one letter.

¹¹ A.V. seems to have arrived at this meaning by connecting "digging" with "searching," digging for something hidden. The synonym חָפַר has both meanings, "dig" and "search for."

spirit there is no *rebellion*? This would be exactly in line with what he says in the psalm.

There is, however, another argument against the genuineness of the clause, the argument from meter. "This clause adds a defective line to a strophe complete without it" (Briggs). This is held also by Bickell and Duham. If this argument prevails, it will still be interesting and important to explain how this addition was made. For Professor Briggs himself has pointed out its striking character: "This renunciation of deceit of spirit is a very high ethical ideal, not appearing elsewhere in the Old Testament." In view of this, and of the above-mentioned argument, it seems likely that the explanation of the origin of the reading רַמְיָה lies along the line before followed; viz., that the clause originally read, in harmony with the context, מִרִּי, which was mistaken for רַמְיָה.

6. KING JAREB IN HOSEA 5:13, 10:6

Of the many explanations collected most fully by President Harper (*Amos and Hosea*, pp. 277 f.), the one that has commended itself as the best is the one which regards מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב as originally being מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב "the great king" = Assyrian *šarru rabû*, "the old nominal ending being retained because the whole expression was thought of as a proper name" (p. 273).¹² It is the king of Assyria according to this proposal who is meant by Hosea. And he is called by one of his titles of honor.

Now it is significant, that this title of honor is given nowhere else in the Old Testament to the king of Assyria by Israelites. In II Kings 18:19, 28 = Is. 36:4, 13 the Assyrian king is called הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל by an *Assyrian* officer. This הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל is the exact Hebrew translation of *šarru rabû*. If these points are kept in mind, it will be seen that the term מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב was not current among the people in Hosea's time as a designation for the king of Assyria. Did Hosea, then, coin the phrase himself? That would imply that the man who protested with all his might

¹²The reading of ᾠ τῆς ἐκείνης is due to corruption; probably the ב of the old Hebrew script was mistaken for מ. It has no claim to originality and should not be used to restore the reading מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב, which has no exact parallel in Assyrian, on which the whole explanation of the reading מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב and מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב depends.

against political alliances with Assyria and Egypt, who opposed most earnestly foreign and especially Assyrian influence, should have come under the influence of Assyrian speech to such an extent that he applies a name of honor to the very king with whom he wants Israel to have nothing to do. What possible reason could he have had, he of all men, to call the king of Assyria by his proud title? Only on one supposition could it be made probable that Hosea used this official name: if he referred to it sarcastically in addressing the princes and nobles, using a phrase which he might have heard at court. But there is no trace of sarcasm in 5:13 and 10:6 in the use of the phrase. In view of the difficulties which beset even this brilliant suggestion I venture to submit a new proposal. In brief it is this: King Jareb is no one else but King *Jeroboam*, ירב is a simple abbreviation of ירבעם. It is under King Jeroboam that Hosea prophesies (Hos. 1:1), and he is mentioned by name in the superscription of Hosea's book. That such abbreviations of names were not uncommon is well known; compare, e. g., Ahaz, whose full name was Jehoahaz, the Assyrians called him *Iauhazi*; or Coniah, Jechonia, Jehojachin; or, יְכֻנָּאִי. I Chron. 24:23, where the Vatican text has *Ιοκομ*, or Shalman for Shalmaneser (Hos. 10:14).

The passages read, then, as follows:

5:13 And Ephraim saw his sickness
And Israel¹³ his sore
And Ephraim went to Asshur
And King Jeroboam sent (messengers) to him.

מֶלֶךְ ירב is subject of the last clause. For אֱלִיר read אֱלִיר. The parallelism of the lines is perfect.

10:6a Yea, it itself shall be brought to Asshur
As a tribute of King Jeroboam.

מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶךְ ירב is not a tribute *for* King Jareb, but a tribute *of* King Jareb. I prefer to retain the Hebrew text rather than change it to מִנְחַת מֶלֶךְ, because it is indetermined. The different use of ל in the first half of the line does not speak against taking

¹³This explanation strengthens the argument against the originality of Judah in the verse.

it as above.—It is probably due to the ל in 10:6 and to the omission of the suffix with לָּ in 5:13 that scholars have always thought a foreign king, Assyrian, Egyptian, or Arabian, was referred to in these passages.

The historical situation under Jeroboam II has led historians to conclude that Assyria must have been responsible to a large extent for Israel's victories over Syria. "Jeroboam's own relations to Assyria," says George Adam Smith,¹⁴ "have not been recorded either by the Bible or by the Assyrian monuments. It is hard to think that he paid no tribute to the 'King of Kings.'" Now, Hos. 5:13; 10:6 explicitly refer to the tribute of Jeroboam. Hos. 5:13 shows that in a time of great distress, when the nation had received a sore "wound," King Jeroboam turned to Assyria for help and "healing." It is highly probable that the Syrian danger is referred to here. Hosea is opposed to these political schemes. There is only one who can help Israel: Yahweh, and Him they have forsaken! Out of His hands no one, not even Assyria, can save them. Hos. 10:6 is not a reference to the past, but an announcement of future happenings. The political situation has not been remedied by seeking Assyrian help, as Hosea had said. Political alliances drain the strength of the nation (7:8). Hosea foresees the time when King Jeroboam will have to send not only the contents of the treasury of the temple at Bethel, but the golden calf as part of the tribute to Assyria. There is a grim sarcasm in the passage, though not in the phrase בִּלְךָ יִרְבֵּה; the golden bull, whom Hosea ridicules, will be sent as a present to Assyria. He cannot help, he is worth only the price of his gold. And then, the folly of it! It will be all of no avail, for the one who will destroy Israel is Yahweh; cf. 10:2 and 10:6, 8. None can avert the awful catastrophe.

In neither of these passages is Assyria the instrument of Yahweh, or is exile in Assyria contemplated by Hosea.

7. COMPOSITION OF HOSEA, CHAP. 2

In an article on "The Story of Hosea's Marriage" in *AJSL*, January, 1906, pp. 120-30, I tried to prove in regard to chap. 2

¹⁴ "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," *Expositor's Bible*, 1898, Vol. I, p. 46.

that certain elements which have been regarded as secondary are in reality a part of Hosea's own story, telling of his determination to do with his adulterous wife as was customary with adulteresses. The following are the verses according to the numbers of the verses in the Hebrew text, which differ from those of the English Versions:

- I. 2:4 $\alpha\beta$ She is not my wife,
 And I am not her husband,
 2:6 And her children I will not pity,
 Because they are children of harlotry,
 2:7 α For their mother has played the harlot,
 She that conceived them has done shamefully.
 2:12 And now will I uncover her shame
 Before the eyes of her lovers,
 And no man shall save her out of my hand.

There is, however, another part of Hosea's own story contained in vss. 4, 5 as Seesemann¹⁵ and Meinhold¹⁶ had already pointed out, but I had not seen their writings at the time. Meinhold thinks that vs. 3 belonged originally to the Hosea-story and restores it as follows, *וְאָמַר לְבָנַי יִזְרְעָאֵל וְלֹא-עַמִּי וּלְבָתִּי לֹא רַחֲמָה* "then said I [i. e., Hosea] to my sons Jezreel and Lo-'Ammi and to my daughter Lo-Ruhamah." This is a very ingenious and plausible suggestion. Perhaps we might restore a little more in harmony with the Massoretic Text as follows, *וְאָמַר לְיִזְרְעָאֵל וְלֹא-עַמִּי וּלְאַחֲוָתָם לֹא רַחֲמָה* "then said I to Jezreel and Lo-'Ammi and to their sister Lo-Ruhamah." One cannot, of course, be dogmatic about such a conjectural reconstruction. But the reconstructed verse forms an admirable introduction to the following, and one has but to read the verses in the light of the suggestion that they belong to the Hosea-story to feel how evident this is.

- II. 2:3 Then said I to Jezreel and Lo-'Ammi
 and to their sister Lo-Ruhamah,
 2:4* Contend with your mother, contend,
 that she put away her whoredoms from her face,
 and her adulteries from between her breasts,
 2:5 α Lest I strip her naked,
 and set her as in the day of her birth.

¹⁵ *Israel und Judah bei Amos und Hosea nebst einem Exkurs über Hos. 1-3*, 1898, pp. 32-44.

¹⁶ *Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1903, pp. 64-73.

This part belongs to an earlier stage of the story of Hosea than 1. Hosea tries to make his wife leave off from her adulterous practices. But in vain! Then comes the stern resolve of 1. Upon this follows chap. 3. I thought that this was all that we had of Hosea's story, and so I wrote "The story breaks off here. We are not told what Hosea did. But there can be no doubt that he obeyed the divine command."¹⁷ But there is still another part, which Seesemann has correctly recognized: vss. 8, 9. It is again striking and interesting that these verses have been regarded as not original.¹⁸ They are as follows:

- III. 2:8 Therefore, behold I will hedge up
 her way¹⁹ with thorns,
 And I will build her a wall
 that she may not find her paths.
 2:9 And when she follows her lovers
 she shall not overtake them;
 and when she seeks them she shall not find them.
 Then shall she say, I will go and return
 to my first husband,
 for it was better with me then than now.

Hosea shows us here how he fulfilled Yahweh's command of chap. 3. He will make it impossible for his wife to have further intercourse with her lovers. He seems to have put her away from his home. He does not supply her with means of living and makes it impossible for her to gain a living by harlotry. A period of suffering results which is intended as moral discipline for her, the result of which is to be her willing return to her husband.

With this Hosea-story there is now woven together the Israel-story, which tells of Israel and her husband Yahweh. It is interesting to see how closely connected the verses belonging to the Israel-story are, now that they are disentangled from the Hosea-story. The beginning is fragmentary.

¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*, p. 125.

¹⁸ Compare Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, p. 236.

¹⁹ Massoretic text has "thy" way, Greek αὐτῆς.

2:5b

And I will make her as the wilderness,
and set her like a dry land,
and slay her with thirst;

2:7b For she said, I will go
after my lovers,
Who give me my bread and my water,
my wool and my flax,
my oil and my drink.

2:10 And she did not know
that it was I who gave her
The corn and the new wine and the oil
and multiplied her silver and gold
[which they used for Baal].

2:11 Therefore I will take back again
my corn in its time,
and my wine in its season,
And will pluck away my wool and my flax
given to cover her nakedness.

2:13 And I will also cause to cease all her mirth,
her feasts, her new moons and her sabbaths
and all her festal assemblies.

The remaining verses of the chapter are all from the Israel-story. The one verse, which does not belong here is vs. 20, for it breaks the close connection between vss. 18, 19, and 21. In vs. 19 we must read מִפִּיָּהּ, out of *thy* mouth, instead of מִפִּיהָ; and in vs. 22 instead of אֵת יְהוָה read אֵתִי, which was regarded as an abbreviated 'אֵת יְהוָה = אֵתִי. Both changes are obvious. On the genuineness of the disputed verses see *AJSL*, January, 1906, pp. 128 f.

There are thus these two stories, the Hosea-story and the Israel-story, woven together in chap. 2 almost as much as in Hosea's own life. It is not simply a literary interest, but a profound human interest in the life and suffering of this great prophet of love that makes the separation of these two stories so important.

8. ISAIAH 14:28

The arguments for placing the prophecy concerning Philistia, Isaiah 14:29-32, in the year when Sargon died, 705 B. C., appear to me conclusive. They need not be repeated here, for they are

well known. This date involves the admission that the superscription in vs. 28 is redactional and that its authority has to be given up, for it states that the oracle dates from the year in which King Ahaz died. But Winckler in his *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 135 ff., maintains that the introductory formula must be ancient and not the work of a redactor. And the genuine formulas in 6:1 and 20:1 so altogether similar to this one, attest the ancient character of 14:28. Winckler dates the oracle from the year 720 B. C. The difficulties connected with this date are formidable; compare Whitehouse, "Isaiah" in *The New Century Bible*, *ad loc.*, and also Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia*, *ad loc.*

The element of truth in Winckler's position is his insistence on the genuineness of vs. 28. But it is most improbable that King Ahaz was mentioned originally in the formula. The whole oracle shows that the king who had died and over whose death Philistia was exulting was King Sargon, and the new king, who would be a more terrible oppressor, was his successor Sennacherib. Whether the introductory sentence contained originally the name of Sargon, which later by some accident dropped out, we cannot tell, but it is evident from the oracle itself that we must explain "in the year of the King's death" as referring to Sargon's death in 705 B. C.

But how could anyone read Ahaz into the text? The reason is very simple: he misread the original text of Isaiah which must have been **בשנת־מות המלך ואֶחָזִה הַמֶּשֶׁא הַזֶּה** "in the year of the King's (Sargon's) death I saw this oracle." For the construction compare Isa. 6:1: **בשנת־מות המלך עֲזִיָּהוּ וְאַרְאֶהָ**, and for the combination of **הַזֶּה** with **מֶשֶׁא** compare Hab. 1:1: **מֶשֶׁא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר הַזֶּה**; Isa. 13:1: **מֶשֶׁא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר הַזֶּה**. The term **מֶשֶׁא** for oracle was a popular term in the time of Jeremiah and there is no reason why the term **מֶשֶׁא** and the phrase **הַזֶּה מֶשֶׁא** should not have been used by Isaiah.

The restoration of the original text is extremely simple, involves a minimum of change, is in accord with the prevailing idea concerning the date, and regards an introduction as original, which the interesting genuine formulas of dating in Isaiah vouch for.

Of course, if the name Sargon was originally in the text, following המלך, which, however, I do not know, the misreading could take place only after it had been omitted for some reason or other. The misreading was a very natural mistake and involved that the ה at the end of אֶחָז was regarded as an abbreviation of הִיָּה. The whole process can easily be seen by placing the two texts together:

בשנת־מות המלך נֶאֱחָזָה המֶשֶׁא הַזֶּה
 בשנת־מות המלך אֶחָז הִיָּה המֶשֶׁא הַזֶּה

THE ORIGIN OF SOME CUNEIFORM SIGNS

GEORGE A. BARTON



THE ORIGIN OF SOME CUNEIFORM SIGNS

GEORGE A. BARTON

Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, to whose industry and scholarship Assyriology owes so much, was the first to attempt a systematic explanation of the origin of all the cuneiform signs. Up to the publication of his *Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems, oder der Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen*, Leipzig, 1897, it had been taken for granted that the cuneiform signs originated in hieroglyphic pictures, although for a large part of them no one had been able to suggest a hieroglyphic form. In reality the origin of about two hundred of them remained unexplained. Delitzsch, in the work mentioned, proposed a new theory of the origin of many of these. While admitting that certain signs originated in pictures, and that others were formed by combinations of pictures, or by doubling and tripling original pictures, he set forth the fact that the Babylonian scribes themselves recognized certain signs as gunus of simpler signs, i. e., as Delitzsch holds, they were made from the simpler signs by adding three or more wedges, sometimes in one position, sometimes in another. In meaning these gunued signs expressed, in Delitzsch's opinion, a "heightening" or "potentializing" of the meaning of the simple signs. From this Delitzsch went a step farther, and inferred that besides this potentializing motif the Babylonian scribes employed many other motifs, each one of which expressed some abstract idea, and that our present syllabary is largely composed of signs artificially formed by combinations of these motifs.

This theory of Delitzsch, although Hommel protested against it at the Oriental Congress in Paris in 1897, has been pretty generally regarded with favor by Assyriologists. Among American scholars Professor Kent¹ has approved and amplified it, and Professor Prince² accepts its explanations for most of the signs.

¹ *The American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XIII, 200 ff.

² *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon*, *passim*.

The authority of Delitzsch's great name and the fact that the theory gave us a semblance of knowledge where before we had only ignorance, led the present writer at first to regard the work of Delitzsch with favor.³ As my Semitic Seminary was devoted in the year 1901-2 to Old Babylonian inscriptions, I was led to study the whole subject anew, and became convinced that Delitzsch's theory is too abstract⁴ to fit the primitive conditions in which the cuneiform signs originated. The discovery was then made that in early times the picture of an object was often made in different ways according to the pleasure of the writer, that in later times there was a struggle for survival between these variant forms, and that what the later scribes regarded as gunus of a simple sign is in most cases simply the survival of a variant picture⁴ of that simple sign. Miss Ellen Seton Ogden, who was a member of the Semitic Seminary in that year, deserves in part the credit of making this discovery with me, and is now at work upon a dissertation in which she will prove that any account of the origin of cuneiform writing based upon the gunu theory of the Babylonian scribes is necessarily as little like the real origin of them as a history of Israel based upon the P document would be like the real history of that people. Any sound method of investigation must first take into account the earliest known forms; secondly, it must take into account *all* the simple ideographic meanings, not simply a few of the most common, as Delitzsch has done; and thirdly, it must follow the psychological principle that the picture originally represented some objective thing, and be able to show how the various meanings came, by psychological processes, to be attached to the picture in question. In applying these principles one will naturally be compelled to make allowances in many cases for a mixture of the meanings of two signs. Such mixture has arisen, first, from a similarity of the forms of two signs, and, secondly, from similarity in the sounds of the names of the objects which the primitive signs represented. These would seem to be the sound principles on which to investigate this subject, though in so complicated a problem these will not always enable us to arrive at certain results.

³ See the writer's *Semitic Origins*, 161.

⁴ Cf. *JAOS*, XXIII, 23, n. 17.

The writer hopes to publish within a few months an investigation of the whole cuneiform syllabary based upon these principles. In the present article he takes the opportunity of presenting in advance a few of the results in a form different from that which in the larger work the complicated nature of the material will render necessary.


Egyptologists are accustomed to arrange the Egyptian hieroglyphs under such headings as "figures of men," "figures of women," "members of the human body," "quadrupeds," "parts of quadrupeds," "implements,"⁵ etc. We can now begin to do the same for Babylonia, though our lists under each heading are as yet much briefer than the Egyptian lists. In the following pages but a few of the writer's results are presented, and those presented are selected almost at random. An effort has been made to illustrate the possibility of introducing into the cuneiform syllabary the same classification which Egyptologists use in arranging the hieroglyphs. Thus in the following table under A are grouped human forms; under B, parts of the human body; under C, animal forms; under D, parts of animals; E, birds; F, fishes; G, trees and plants; H, water and canals; I, houses and their parts; J, implements and vessels; K, articles of apparel; L, fire. Had space permitted, the examples under several of these heads might have been made more numerous, and several additional classes might have been added. In the first part of the table a tolerably complete genealogy of the later forms is in each case given, but from class G, No. 2, onward, only a few of the forms of each sign are presented. This compression for the sake of economizing space does not seriously affect the illustrative examples. No effort has been made to follow the archaic revival of old forms which may be seen in many of the records of Assyrian Neo-Babylonian kings. That is sufficiently done in Amiaud and Méchineau's *Tableau Comparé*. The principles on which this work is done must in the present article be presented by illustration rather than by full demonstration.

The sign in A, 1 has long been correctly recognized as the picture of a man.⁶ A, 2, Delitzsch regards as the picture of a

⁵ See the tables in the Egyptian grammars of Brugsch and Erman. Hommel followed this method in the paper read at the Paris Congress of Orientalists, but I was unable to procure a copy of his article until after this essay had been sent to press.

⁶ So, Houghton, *TSBA*, VI, 462, and Delitzsch, *Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen*, 23.

man, plus the motif for 'great,'⁷ but Rylands made a suggestion, which is quoted and approved by Houghton,⁸ that it is the picture of a man surmounted by a crown or umbrella. This suggestion is, I believe, on the right track. Primitive Babylonian sheiks or kings, like many others, wore a magnificent headdress, out of which the crowns of later time were developed, and this motif for 'great' is nothing but a rude representation of this primitive headdress.⁹ In considering A, 3, the ideographic meanings do not aid us, as the one meaning given (Kakasiga, *S*^b, IV, 27) has not yet been successfully translated; but the form suggests that the original was the picture of a man standing with one arm bent and the hand resting on the hip. A, 4 of the table is a difficult sign, as among its ideographic meanings there are none which designate objective concrete things. The meanings are: 'seize,' 'go out,' 'be high,' 'be full,' 'flaming' or 'brilliant,' 'lift up,' 'lifting up' (of the hands in prayer), 'pardon,' 'be high,' 'be heavy,' 'to honor.' The earliest form of the sign which we have is considerably removed from a pictograph, but is still sufficiently close to suggest that its original was the picture of a king wearing his primitive headdress, standing with one hand resting on his hip and the other outstretched.

B, 1 represented the legs of a man (cf. the Egyptian , Erman, *Aeg. Grammatik*, 2d ed., p. 208, No. 96). These strong legs were apparently in accordance with Semitic ideas used to denote strength. (Cf. "He delighteth not in the strength of the horse, he taketh no pleasure in the legs of a man," Ps. 147:10.) By natural psychological processes it then came to signify 'deeds,' 'fight,' 'wrath,' 'anger,' and 'rise against.' B, 2, as Delitzsch has recognized,¹⁰ represents the buttocks, and so naturally came to stand for 'later,' 'after,' 'future.' B, 3, 4, and 5 form an interesting series. B, 3 is a head; B, 4 the same with two lines which represent the lips, while the analogy of the development of these two, as shown by a comparison of their genealogies, makes it clear that B, 5 represented a head to the face of which a beard was attached. This apparently suggested a full-grown man, hence we have the meanings 'strength,' 'be strong,' 'protection.' These

⁷ UKZ, pp. 103 ff.⁸ TSBA, VI, 462 n. 1.⁹ Cf. below, K, 2.¹⁰ Nachwort, p. 45, n. 1.

naturally suggest the opposite, 'fear,' which became also one of the meanings. It would also stand for an old man, hence it signifies 'be old,' 'rest.' It also represents two deities, Šalulu and Šalmu. Was it because these gods were pictured with beards? Delitzsch¹¹ makes much of the fact that the Assyrian scribes (*S*^a, II, 42) call this sign a *gunu* of B, 1. That was natural in later times when the old pictorial form was lost, but research now makes it clear that originally the sign was born not because an abstract potentializing motif was attached to a picture of a head, but because it pictured a head with a beard. B, 6 was evidently originally a rude outline of a head and neck. Its position is the reverse of B, 3. Perhaps this was to emphasize the idea of the neck. This picture expresses directly the meanings 'neck,' 'head,' and 'man.' Through the meaning 'head' the meanings 'front,' 'totality,' etc., might attach themselves to the sign. Through the meaning 'man,' that of 'brother,' 'side,' etc., came to be expressed by it. Through 'front,' it might come to signify 'fight,' though this meaning may have been suggested by the severed head. How it came to mean 'house,' 'door,' 'beam,' 'peg,' and 'land,' it is difficult to tell, unless there was a mixture with pictures of houses (I, 3, 4, or 5). B, 7, explained by Delitzsch¹² as *gunu*, is probably, as comparison with B, 6 shows, a neck and head surmounted by some sort of headdress or burden. Its one meaning is 'tribute.' Whether it pictured tribute brought on the head, as portrayed on the black obelisk of Shalmaneser, or whether the severed head itself, often bound with a costly turban, was tribute or booty, it is difficult to say. Perhaps this and the preceding sign were pictured reversed to indicate that the head was severed from the body, in which case the head itself would be the 'tribute.' B. 8 is evidently the left shoulder, arm, and hand. Its one ideographic meaning is 'left.' B, 9, 10, 12, and 13 have long been recognized as of phallic origin,¹³ but B, 11 has not before been satisfactorily explained. Delitzsch (*op. cit.*, 177 ff.), explains it as compounded of a motif for direction plus a motif which he cannot explain. The earliest

¹¹ UKZ, 63. That the scribes sometimes grouped as *gunu*s signs which had not even a common origin may be seen by comparing *S*^a, 19 with Thureau-Dangin's *Recherches*, Nos. 447 and 91.

¹² UKZ, 123.

¹³ Oppert, *Exp. en Mésopotamie*, II, 111, 115; Delitzsch, UKZ, 93, 28 ff.

form of the sign bears a striking resemblance to a clay phallus found at Ashur and pictured in the *Mittheilungen der deutsch. Orients-Gesellschaft*, No. 22 (June, 1904), p. 26, and I have no doubt represented an ithyphallus. Such a picture would naturally express 'unto,' 'in,' 'in the midst of,' 'out from,' 'with,' 'desire,' etc. B, 14 has also long been recognized¹⁴ as a foot, though until a few years since no such perfect picture had been found as that in an inscription published by Scheil (*Délégation en Perse*, II, 130).



Class C represents animals. No. 1 was probably the picture of a donkey, as in proto-Elamitic, or a donkey's head and neck, as apparently in the Hoffman tablet. Delitzsch's explanation (*op. cit.*, 149), seems unnatural in comparison. The meanings 'ass' and 'horse' confirm this origin. C, 2 was evidently the picture of a pig. This the one ideographic meaning, 'swine,' confirms.

In Class D, No. 1 is the picture of the tuft of the tail of some animal, as a cow or lion. Our form comes from the time of Sargon, however, and what the first perpendicular sign represents it is impossible to tell. As an ideogram it means 'tail,' 'part of an animal or human body,' and possibly 'fly'—meanings easily suggested by the picture. D, 2 represents a dressed animal hung up by the hind legs and cut open in front, such as may be seen both in the East and West where meat is dressed upon farms. It means 'flesh.' D, 3, 4, and 5 represent teats. Possibly D 5 is that of a human breast. This origin most satisfactorily accounts for all their meanings. This origin proposed for D 3 and 5 is not new,¹⁵ but so far as I know D 4 has not been so explained; but the forms and the meanings ('fat,' 'oil,' 'bright,' 'full,' 'satisfied,' etc.) combine to prove this. D, 6 and 7 are pictures of the head of an ox, differing only in that one represents the eyes and the other does not.

Class E contains pictures of birds. Nos. 1 and 2 are too clear


¹⁴ See Oppert, *EM*, II, 108, and Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 16, 28.

¹⁵ Cf. Ball, *PSBA*, XIII, 491, who mentions this explanation for D, 3 only to reject it. Ball's objection that it did not also mean 'milk' loses its force when we know that variant pictures of the same thing had that meaning. Cf. also for D, 5 Prince, *Sumerian Lex.*, 111, who gets at the meaning, 'teat,' in a roundabout and artificial way after the manner of Delitzsch. It is far more probable that it was the simple picture of a 'teat.'

to need comment.¹⁶ No. 3 is a bird and an egg. This had apparently never been suspected until the researches of Thureau-Dangin brought to light the pictorial form. This form satisfactorily accounts for the ideographic meanings, 'to bear,' 'a son which is borne,' 'some sexual organ' (possibly 'clitoris'), 'kin' or 'family,' 'womb' or 'inclosure.' By a natural psychological process, 'impetuous,' 'strong,' and 'to fear' became attached to it also. E, 4, which means 'raven' and 'bird,' is shown by analogy with the developed forms of E, 1, as well as by the meanings, to have been originally the picture of a bird also. E, 5 has long been a puzzle. Its meanings: 'young offspring,' 'young ox,' (or 'child'), 'cattle,' 'kid,' 'gazelle,' are all derivable from a single idea. Delitzsch (*op. cit.*, 160) holds that it is compounded of , 'gazelle,' plus , 'crowd.' When, however, we compare this sign with the egg in E, 3, and with the way in which the bird forms (E, 1, 2, and 3) developed in Babylonian writing, it becomes clear that this sign was the picture of a young bird in process of being hatched from an egg. This view, when natural psychological association is taken into consideration, would account for all the meanings. It stood for young bird and then was used to signify other young animals.

Class F includes pictures of fishes. F, 1 is evidently the diagram of a fish.¹⁷ This would account for the meanings: 'fish,' 'to peel' (on account of preparing a fish for eating), 'the god Ea,' because he was represented in the form of a fish;¹⁸ then from the greatness of Ea it came to stand for 'prince,' 'great,' and 'very much.' F, 2 and 3 have long been recognized as fishes,¹⁹ though Delitzsch (*op. cit.*, 63 ff.) follows the Babylonian scribes in regarding No. 3 as a gunu of No. 2. The meanings 'monster,' 'broad,' 'fat,' are equally explained on the supposition that the picture represented a larger fish with a dorsal fin.

¹⁶ On E, 1 see Hommel, *Sum. Lex.*, No. 67; Hilprecht, *OBI*, Pt. II, 35, n. 4; Ball, *PSBA*, XIII, 378 and XX, 16 ff.; also Barton, *JAOS*, XXII, 121. On E, 2 cf. Oppert, *EM*, II, 108, and Houghton, *TSBA*, VI, 464.

¹⁷ Sayce, quoted by Houghton, *TSBA*, VI, 470, explained it as a scepter which a prince carried; Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 343, regards it as originally a weapon; while Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 161 ff., compounds it of , 'man,' plus the gunu signs.

¹⁸ See Barton, *Semitic Origins*, pp. 91 and 196.

¹⁹ See Oppert, *EM*, II, p. 108, and Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 70 ff.

In Class G we have placed trees and plants. G, 1 (unless the sign has been written the other end up from the usual method) is a potted plant. If reversed, it may be the picture of a pine or cypress. Its chief meanings are 'garden' and 'cypress' or 'pine.' G, 2 represents two plants growing in a pot. Its two clear meanings are 'plant' and 'garment.' The latter meaning was probably attached to the sign through the use of flax as material for clothing. G, 3 Delitzsch has rightly said²⁰ is a plant or tree growing in (or by) water. G, 4 and 6 are reeds;²¹ G, 5 two trees growing. All the meanings of these signs have grown out of ideas suggested by these pictures. G, 7, as has long been recognized, represents two heads of grain.²² G, 8, representing a palm tree, in early times was expressed through variant pictures. The picture which survived, as Professor Hommel suggested to me in a private letter after reading *Semitic Origins*, pp. 105 ff., was the picture of a palm tree growing in the midst of irrigating ditches, the tops of which were blowing in the wind as shown in the following sketch:²³



Under H are grouped water and canals. H, 1, the wavy lines for water, resembles both the early Chinese²⁴ (≈) and the Egyptian²⁵ (≡) characters. A common psychological impulse underlies the mode of expression in these widely different centers of evolution. H, 2 represents the little irrigating ditches by which gardens are irrigated. One sees them everywhere in the East.²⁶ H, 3 is not so certain. Hommel has suggested (see Delitzsch, *Nachwort*, p. 19) that it is the picture of a leathern bottle, and so suggested 'desert.' It seems to me more probable that it is a rude outline of the lower Mesopotamian valley with its two great rivers and (in early times) occasional sections of irrigated and so

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 131 ff.

²¹ No. 6 is not a *gunu* of No. 4, but a picture of a larger variety of reed, as the earliest form makes evident.

²² Cf. Houghton, *TSBA*, VI, 475; Ball, *PSBA*, XX, 19; and Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 125 ff. Ball and Delitzsch are not so specific as Houghton.

²³ For previous explanations, see Ball, *PSBA*, XVI, 193, and Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, 144 ff.

²⁴ See Chalfant, *Early Chinese Writing* (Pittsburg, 1906), Pl. VI, No. 84.

²⁵ Cf. Erman, *op. cit.*, p. 217, No. 55.

²⁶ So Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

fertile land. That would account for the meanings 'plain,' 'lands,' etc. By an extension of the latter meaning it came to signify 'desert,' 'elevated country,' and then 'back.'

Class I includes houses and their parts. I, 1 is probably lattice-work to suggest a reed house. I, 3, 4, and 5 are perhaps reed houses built on stilts. One of them represents the river in overflow, as the fish in the lower story shows. Possibly Nos. 3 and 4 were intended to represent the common reed hut of the country with a band about it to hold it together.²⁷ I, 2 is clearly a picture of an oriental door.²⁸ One sees them in many places closely resembling this, with a door socket at the bottom, the revolving post standing in it, and the door considerably raised above the threshold.

Class J includes implements. Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are clearly arrows. Hilprecht (*OBI*, Pt. II, p. 35) is much more nearly right than Delitzsch as to the origin of J, 2. J, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are different forms of nets. J, 4 was shaped somewhat like a modern insect net and is represented as held by the two hands. This view is confirmed by the meanings. The concrete meanings are a 'net' and 'pit'(?). These are just the objective meanings from which the others can be psychologically derived or suggested, e.g., 'throw down,' 'remove,' 'to storm,' 'to take,' 'to spoil,' etc. By variation and extension of these the sign was used to express 'to bring,' 'to think,' 'to protect,' 'to love,' and the 'goddess Ishtar.' The last meaning was probably attached to it because the goddess ensnared men; then 'to love' was associated with it because of the goddess. J, 5 and 7 Delitzsch correctly recognized as nets,²⁹ though as the oldest form of J, 6 had not come to light when Delitzsch wrote he went astray in explaining that sign.³⁰ It is in reality a net reversed, and as J, 5 naturally expresses 'overthrow,' 'curse,' 'cord,' 'rope,' 'sinew,' so No. 6, 'a snare rendered impotent,' suggested by the fact that it was a snare, 'fear,' 'be afraid;' then,

²⁷ See Peters, *Nippur*, II, 74 ff.; Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, 160; Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, p. 282.

²⁸ Oppert, *EM*, II, 108, was on the right track, calling it a column and lintel. Lehmann, *Litteratur Centralblatt*, January 8, 1898, suggested the right explanation.

²⁹ *UKZ*, 165 ff.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 97 ff. He explains it as composed of two gunu motifs.

from its position 'to wash' and 'anoint,' washing and anointing having such a prominent part to play in removing spells; then, as a special extension of this line of meanings it denoted a class of priests who attended to such matters.

The group J, 8-J, 14 consists of pictures derived from various forms of pottery.³¹ J, 8 is a clay bowl for measuring, having a round bottom such that it could be easily held in the hand.³² J, 9 is probably a jar with a pointed bottom, such as one often sees in the East, though the meanings in this case are too uncertain to help in identifying the picture. J, 10 is shown by analogy with the other signs derived from pictures of jars to be derived from the representation of such an object.³³ Here as in other cases the jar is made to stand for some special thing that a jar could contain. Possibly they had a special type of jar for honey. At all events this ideogram was ultimately limited, as appears from our present information, to 'honey' and 'good.' J, 11 is a common drinking-jug, similar to those one sees often in the East, set on a rude stool, such as may be found today.³⁴ It signified 'a vessel,' then, 'abundance,' then, possibly because of its pressure on the base, it expressed 'oppression,' and 'distress.' J, 12 and 13 are variant pictures of the same kind of drinking-jar as that pictured in No. 11, though without the stool or base. The only real difference is that one has a line of ornamentation on the side and the other does not. In usage the ornamented one was used to suggest 'strong drink,' then, by a natural process of association, 'speak,' and 'approach,' while the plain one signified simply 'vessel' or 'pot.' J, 14 was a jar of a different form. The one or two lines of ornamentation on it were transformed by the later scribes into the sign for water. This fact indicates that we should be cautious in assuming, except in the presence of very early epigraphic evidence, that a sign is composed by putting together two others.³⁵

³¹ See de Morgan's pottery series of proto-Elamite signs, in *Recueil de travaux*, XXVII, 237 ff.

³² First identified by Barton, *JAOS*, XXIII, 24.

³³ In *JAOS*, XXIII, 24 I made a tentative guess at the original of this—a bee entering a hive—which I now abandon.

³⁴ One ought, perhaps, to compare such bases for holding jars as are pictured in Benzinger's *Heb. Archaeologie*, pp. 252 ff.

³⁵ Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 168 ff., makes this inference.

J, 15 is the picture of a covered and probably a steaming pot.³⁶ It therefore represented 'rejoicing,' 'exulting,' 'bursting forth,' and probably on account of its heat, the opposite idea of 'be afraid' (galadu).

Under K, I have classed signs which I regard as originally representations of articles of clothing, although I am aware that my opinion in the case of one of them rests on uncertain evidence. K, 1 I regard as a picture of some article of clothing of a priest, and K, 2 the headdress of a sheik or king. It is true that the oldest forms of K, 1 known to us do not resemble anything closely enough to be certainly identified. It seems clear, however, that two different pictures have been blended in the sign.³⁷ In order to form an opinion as to the origin, we must call in the assistance of the meanings. They are 'a cistern' (?) or 'precious stone' (alallu), 'road' or 'progress' (alaktu), 'to make sweet,' 'man' or 'lord,' 'wool,' an 'offering,' 'gift' or 'almoner,' 'a seal,' 'to count,' 'number,' 'a kind of tree,' 'god Marduk,' 'to cut off,' 'an officer,' 'a jar,' 'a signet,' and 'a priest.' Such a list appears at first to be a hopeless mixture. As Thureau-Dangin has noted, however, the meanings, 'water-holder' and 'jar'³⁷ have been attached to this sign through a mixture with J, 14. Of the other meanings, 'wool' is an objective and primitive one, and I suspect that the picture represented some priestly breastplate or headdress, made of that material, that the sign came to stand accordingly for 'priest,' and that the other meanings were gradually associated with the sign in consequence of the duties of a priest. Of course, however, the discovery of an earlier text may show that this view is mistaken.³⁸

K, 2 has already been treated above under A, 2. I believe it was the headdress of a sheik or a king, and for that reason came to be the symbol for 'great.' Its occurrence in one text separated from the head of the king,³⁹ when one considers the freedom of

³⁶ Cf. Barton, *JAOS*, XXII, 127, n. 2.

³⁷ I cannot agree with Thureau-Dangin, *Supplément*, No. 419, that the two forms were originally the same.

³⁸ Delitzsch, *UKZ*, 168 ff., regards it as a system of canals.

³⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *Supplément*, No. 99.

treatment which the ancient scribes allowed themselves, does not disprove that view.

L, 1 is a primitive bowl into which two tinder sticks are inserted to ignite them by friction.⁴⁰ It stood accordingly for 'fire,' 'smith,' etc. L, 2, meaning 'brightness,' 'new,' 'shining,' was a representation of a torch. 'Pour out' is a meaning attached to it by psychological association.

NOTE

The abbreviations in the following table will nearly all be readily recognized by Assyriologists. The following, perhaps, need explanation:

Déc. = de Sarzec's *Découvertes en Chaldée*.

Délégation or *Dél.* = J. de Morgan's *Délégation en Perse*.

HLC = Barton's *Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets*, Philadelphia, 1905.

Manišusu = the inscription of that monarch published in *Délégation*, Vol. II.

Ranke = *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. VI.

Rec. = Thureau-Dangin, *Recherches sur l'origine de l'écriture cunéiforme*.















































































RTC = Thureau-Dangin's *Recueil de tablettes chaldéennes*, Paris, 1903.

Sup. = *Supplément* to Thureau-Dangin's *Recherches*.
































Tablet 𐎶 = an unpublished archaic tablet.







































UKZ = Delitzsch's *Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems oder Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen*, Leipzig, 1897.











































⁴⁰ Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, 178 and Prince, *Sumerian Lexicon*, p. 58, have thus correctly explained it.
















































A. 1	               	<p>Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2^{bis}, No. 2. Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3, A, III, 4. Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 7. Maništusu, Face A, XII, 6 and 14. Gudea Statue, B, VIII, 3. ^{III}Ur. HLC, Pl. 2, No. 379, I, 1. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, X, 3. Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i>, No. 17, 7. El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 8, 20. Cassite, Clay, Vol. XIV, No. 167, 23. " " " " " 91a, 26 Nebuchad. I, I, 38. Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR. 1, 58. Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 6, 15.</p>	              
A. 2	                       	<p>En-šag-kuš-an-na, OBI, No. 90, 2. Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2^{bis}, No. 1. Eannadu. <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4, A, I, 5. Mešelim, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1^{ter}, No. 2. Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 2. Maništusu, Face C, XXII, 18. Sargon, OBI, No. 1, I, 3. Pre-Sargonic, JCI, No. 1, env. II, 4. Gudea Statue, B, VII, 14. Gudea Cyl. A, VII, 1 ^{III}Ur, e. g. HLC, Pl. 47, No. 376, rev. 12. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, I, 2, and <i>passim</i>. Period of Hammurabi, Ranke, No. 28, 25. El-Amarna, Berl., No. 104, 1, and <i>passim</i>. Cassite, Clay, Vol. XIV, No. 56, 9. Nebuchad. I, I, 2. Assyrian, Tig-pil I, IR. 9, 12. Assyr. Assurb. VR. 1, 2. Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 2, 6.</p>	                      




































A. 3			Maništusu, Face D. IV, 4 and 9.	
			Sargon, unedited photo, cf. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Rec.</i> No. 314.	
			Sargon, TCI, No. 44, rev. 1.	
			Gudea Cyl. A, II, 5.	
			III Ur, HLC, Pl. 24, No. 27, VIII, 10.	
			Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i> , No. 106, 1.	
			Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , I, 57.	
			I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 112, 3.	
			El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 38, 4.	
			Nebuchad. I, I, 22.	
			Assyrian, e. g. Tig-Pil. I. I R, 15, 64.	
			Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 839, 5.	
A. 4			Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> p. LI, No. 4, IX, 2.	
			Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> p. XXXVII, No. 10, 4, 3.	
			Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II. 42.	
			Maništusu, Face C, XVII, 1.	
			Gudea Statue, E, VII, 3.	
			III Ur, HLC, Pl. 21, No. 11, rev. 3.	
			" " " 3, " 17, II, 3	
			" " " 9, " 18, V, 6.	
			Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 12.	
			I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 84, 34.	
			Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nebuchad.</i> No. 193, 6.	
			Assyrian, e. g. IVR ² , 27, 48a.	
B. 1			Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4, A, VI, 1	
			Maništusu, Face D, XI, 13	
			Pre-Sargonic, CT, V, No. 22506, IV, 2; also Gudea Statue, G, II, 10.	






































		Pre-Sargonic, OBI, No. 11, obv. 6.	
		" " " " " " 7.	
		Gudea Cyl. A, I, 14.	
		III Ur, HLC, Pl. 9, I, 2 etc.	
		" " " 23, No. 29, III, 23.	
		" " " 22, VI, 16.	
		Hammurabi <i>Laws</i> , XLIV, 53.	
		I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 112, 9.	
		El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 24, Rs. 91.	
		Cassite, Clay, Vol. XIV, No. 73, 34.	
		" " " " " 73, 29, 37, 38.	
		Nebuchad. I, I, 51.	
		Assyrian, e. g. NE. 115, 30.	
		Neo-Bab. e.g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 188, 16.	
B. 2		TCI, No. 1, II, 4.	
		Gudea Statue, G, II, 10.	
		Gudea Cyl. B, XV, 13.	
		" " " XXIV, 17.	
		I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, List, No. 82.	
		Cassite, Clay, Vol. XIV, No. 131, 12.	
		Assyrian, e. g. CT, XIII, 16, 48.	
B. 3		Neo-Bab. Peiser, KAS, No. XII, 23.	
		Blau, Monument A, rev. 3.	
		<i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{bis} , No. 1, b, II, 2.	
		Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> 4 ^{ter} , F ₂ , II, 1.	
		Entemena, CT, X, 1, 21.	
		Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, III, 35.	
		Pre-Sargonic, RCT, No. [4], II, 4.	
		Manistusu, Face A, VIII, 7.	








































	 Gudea Cyl. A, I, 25; also III Ur, HLC, Pl. 38,  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXXVI, 89. [I, 6.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 90, 16:  Tiglath-Pileser, I, IR, 9, 81.  Assyrian, e. g. VR, 4, 18 (Assurb.).  Neo-Bab., e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 1, 4.	
B. 4	  Blau, Monument A, obv. II, 3.  <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{ter} , No. 5, II, 4.  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> 4 ^{tor} , F ² , III, 5.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 28.  " " " " III, 26.  Manistusu, Face A, XIV, 7.  TCI, No. 4, env. II, 2.  Gudea Statue, B, II, 9 and Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , IV, 24.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 8, No. 396, III, 8.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 6, 17.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 21, 30.  Cassite, Clay, Vol. XIV, No. 58, 31.  Nebuchad. I, I, 15.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 59.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 115, 2.	
B. 5	  Archaic, RTC, No. [13], rev. III, 1, 5.  En-šag-Kuš-an-na, OBI, No. 90, 3.  TCI, No. 1, Env. IV, 2.  Gudea Cyl. B, VII, 21.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 30, VI, 4.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 48.  Assyrian, e. g., S ^a II, 44.	
B. 6	  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{ter} , No. 4, 18.  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4 ^{bis} , IX, 2.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, III, 7.  Manistusu. Face C. VIII 3.	



































	 Sargon, TCI, No. 44, 3.  Gudea Statue, B, VI, 53.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 32, I, 22.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XII, 13.  Shamshi-Adad, IR, 30, II, 13.  Bab. Boundary-stone, IIIR, 41, I, 2, 9.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 267, 1.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 2, 41.	
B. 7	  III Ur, CT, VII, No. 12,946, obv. 6.  I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 90, 7.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 3, rev. 18.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 26, 13c.	
B. 8	  <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1bis, No. 1a, I, 2.  TCI, No. 12, II, 3.  OBI, Pl. VI, VIII, 20.  Gudea Cyl. A, IV, 19.  " " B, XIV, 12.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXI, 60.  El-Amarna, London, No. 17, 5.  Tiglath-Pileser I, IR, 10, 55  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 25, 10.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 8, 10.	
B. 9	  Blau, Monument A, obv. IV, 2.  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4, A, III, 4.  Entemena, <i>Déc.</i> p. XLVII, I, 13 and 31.  Maništusu, Face D, IV, 13.  TCI, No. 35, env. 7 and 8.  " " 52, 5.  Gudea Statue, B, IV, 2.  " Cyl. A, V, 10.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 8, III, 10.  " " <i>passim</i> , e. g. Pl. 35, VII, 16.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , III, 36 etc.  " " II, 69.  Nebuchad. I, I, 58.  " " 3.	































		Assyrian, e. g. Sen. Taylor Cyl. VI, 12. Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 110, 4.	
B. 10		 Blau, Monument A, obv. IV, 2.  Maništusu, Face C, VII, 13.  TCI, No. 7, env. V, 2.  Gudea Statue, C, II, 20.  " Cyl. A, XII, 6.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 13, No. 44, 7.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 44.  " " XXXIX, 80.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 8, rev. 4.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nebuchad.</i> No. 43, 20.	
B. 11		 Archaic, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{ter} , No. 5, V, 5.  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{ter} , No. 2, 4.  Eannadu, CT, Pl. 1, II, 4 and III, 5.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 46 and III, 5.  RTC, No. [8], I, 5.  Gudea Statue, B, V, 6, and Cyls. <i>passim</i> .  III Ur, HLC, <i>passim</i> , e. g. Pl. 2, No. 379, I, 5.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XIV, 27, etc.  " <i>Letters</i> , No. 22, 7.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 8, 15.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nebuchad.</i> No. 116, 8.  Assyrian, e. g. Tig.-Pil. I, IR, 11, 49.	
B. 12		 Archaic, E. A. Hoffman, Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19,  Maništusu, Face C, IX, 6. [I, 2.  TCI, No. 4, endroit, II, 5.  Gudea Statue, B, IV, 5.  " Cyl. A, VII, 16.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 29, I, 9.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXII, 80.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXII, 75, etc.  1 st Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 17, 39, etc.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 90, 11.  Cassite, Clay, XIV, 91a, 30 etc.  Nebuchad. I, I, 50.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 11, 5.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 124.	
B. 13		 Maništusu, Face B, III, 11.  TCI, No. 32, 2.	














































	 Gudea Statue, B, VII, 31.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 21, No. 102, 5.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 44.  I Dynasty of Babylon, Ranke, No. 11, 29.  Cassite, Clay, XII, No. 58, 25.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 196, 8.  Assyrian, e. g. II, R, 39, 71a.	
B. 14	  Archaic, <i>Délégation</i> , II, 130, 1.  Archaic, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1bis, No. 1, obv. II, 1.  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2bis, No. 2, and Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4ter, F ² , II, 3.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 46.  Manistusu, Face B, IV, 1.  RTC, No. [9], rev. II, 2.  TCI, No. 1, obv. I, 2.  Gudea Statue, B, IV, 4.  " Cyl. A, I, 10.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 3, I, 11.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , IX, 20.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 52, rev. 21.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 118.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nebuchad.</i> No. 108, 7.	
C. 1	  Proto-Elamite, <i>Dél.</i> VI, No. 4,997, rev. 5.  Archaic, E. A. Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, III, 3.  Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 32, B, IV, 5.  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3bis, E ¹ , I, 9.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 10.  Manistusu, Face C, IX, 16.  Gudea Statue, F, IV, 10.  " Cyl. A, X, 19.  III Ur, HLC, Pls. 34 and 35, <i>passim</i> .  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 46.	






































		El-Amarna, London, No. 35, 23, " " " 5, 29.	
		Nebuchad. I, I, 20.	
		Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 34.	
		Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 140, 1.	
C. 2		 Sargon, TCI, No. 1, obv. IV, 2.	
		" " " 41, obv. 8.	
		HLC, Pl. 12, No. 52, 8, etc.	
		Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 58.	
		Neo-Bab. e. g. VR, 46, 19a.	
		Esarhaddon, Cyl. I, 45, II, 14.	
		Assurb. e. g. IVR ² , 43, 8b.	
D. 1		 Sargon, unpublished text, <i>Rec.</i> No. 434.	
		Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i> , No. 154, III, 22.	
		Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXXVII, 31.	
		Assyrian, e. g. Tiglath-Pileser, IR, 9, 77.	
		Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 700, 10.	
		" " " Clay, <i>Murashu</i> , No. 54, 9.	
D. 2		 Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XLIII, 27.	
		" " XXXVII, 32.	
		Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 8, 32.	
		Neo-Bab. e. g. Darius, AJSL, XVI, 73, No. 16, 1 and 6.	
D. 3		 Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> 2 ^{bis} <i>passim</i> , 2 ^{ter} <i>passim</i> .	
		" " " 2 ^{ter} , No. 1, III, 5.	
		Eannadu, CT, IX, No. 85, 977, II, 2.	
		" " " 85, 978, I, 1.	
		RTC, No. [11], rev. III, 2, cf. No. [10], II, 1.	
		Manistusu, Face A, II, 13.	
		Ur-Bau, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 8, I, 7.	
		Gudea Cyl. A, VIII, 21.	




































		III Ur, HLC, <i>passim</i> .	
		Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , I, 9.	
		Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 9, 6.	
		El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 4, 4.	
		Assyrian, e. g. Tig Pil. I, IR, 10, 25.	
		Neo-Bab. e. g. Cyrus, VR, 35, 21.	
D. 4		 TCI. No. 4, env. I, 2.  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{ter} , No. 4, 4  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3 ^{bis} , D ¹ , I, 11.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 28, 29.  Manishtusu, Face A, V, 10.  Sargon, OBI, No. 1, I, 2.  Gudea, e. g. Statue B, VIII, 5.  Gudea, e. g. Cyl. A, I, 1.  III Ur, Ur-Gur, CT, XXI, Pl. 5, No. 90,001, 7.  " " " " " " " " 2.  " " " " " " " " 7, " 90,000, 4.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 2, No. 379, III, 4.  " e. g. HLC, Pl. 50, No. 144, rev. 3.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , e. g. II, 12.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 8, 8.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 2, 1.  Nebuchad. I, I, 4.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, I, 11.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 43.	
D. 5		 RTC, No. [11], rev. I, 1.  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> p. XXXV, No. 4, 15.  Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4 ^{bis} , D ² , II, 2.  " " " 3, A, I, 4.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 30.  " " " " II, 7.  Manishtusu, Face A, II, 15.  Sargon, OBI, No. 1, 3.  Gudea Statue, B, IV, 3.  " Cyl. A, II, 22; Cyl. B, XVII, 15.	

		 III Ur, e. g. HLC, Pl. 36, No. 334, 2.  " " " " 7, " 337, 4.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 32, etc.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 43, 5.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 18, rev. 14.  Nebuchad. I, I, 43.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 3, 131.  Neo-Bab. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 938, 1.	
D. 6	⇒	 Maništusu, Face C, X, 14.  RTC, No. [11], rev. III, 2.  Naram-Sin, TCI, No. 19, rev. 1.  Gudea Statue, B, IX, 8.  Gudea Cyl. A, V, 8.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 22, No. 26, V, 20.  " " " 23, " 29, IV, 15.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , IV, 54.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 1, 3.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 1, 8; London, No. 41, 8.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 62.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 234, 3.	
D. 7	⇒	 Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3bis, D ¹ , I, 24.  RTC, No. [17], IV, 7.  Gudea Statue, F, III, 12.  III Ur, HLC, Pls. 34 and 35, <i>passim</i> .  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 45, etc.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 15, 13.  El-Amarna, London, No. 35, 21.  " " " " 5, 23.  Cassite, Clay, List, No. 123.  " " No. 99a, 17.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 2, 132.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 72, 12.	

E. 1	  <p>Blau, Monument A, obv. I, 2.</p>  <p><i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1bis, No. 1, obv. IV, 1.</p>  <p>Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2, A, I, 7; CT. VII, Pl. II, 6.</p>  <p>Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 24.</p>  <p>OBI, No. 112, 5.</p>  <p>“ “ 114, 2 and 4.</p>  <p>Maništusu, Face C. VII, 29.</p>  <p>Gudea Statue, B, II, 18.</p>  <p>Gudea Cyl. B, V, 6.</p>  <p>III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i>, No. 125, II, 6.</p>  <p>III Ur, HLC, Pl. 8, I, 5.</p>  <p>“ “ “ 10, No. 158, obv. 7.</p>  <p>Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, VII, 9; <i>Letters</i>, No. 97, 23.</p>  <p>El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 90, 16.</p>  <p>Cassite, Clay, XIV, No. 110, 7.</p>  <p>Assyrian, Tig Pil. I, IR, 10, 50, and 70.</p>  <p>Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 30, 8.</p>  <p>Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 84.</p>	
E. 2	  <p>Archaic, unedited text in Louvre; cf. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Sup.</i> No. 33.</p>  <p>Archaic, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1bis, rev. I, 3.</p>  <p>Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> 4ter, F², V, 4.</p>  <p>Maništusu, Face B, I, 7.</p>  <p>Sargon, TCI, No. 27, env. 4.</p>  <p>III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i>, No. 35, VII, 6.</p>  <p>“ HLC, Pl. 8, No. 396, I, 11.</p>  <p>“ “ “ “ “ “ II, 12.</p>	

















	 Gudea Cyl. A, XXV, 6.  " Statue, E, V, 12.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VII, 13.  " " " 6, 25, etc.  " <i>Letters</i> , No. 59, 9 and 13.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 6, 5.  Tiglath-Pileser I, IR, 14, 63.  Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian, <i>passim</i> .	
E. 3	  Archaic, unedited text in Louvre; cf. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Sup.</i> No. 36.  Manistusu, Face B, XIII, 10.  TCI, No. 11, end, I, 1.  Gudea Statue, B, VI, 49.  IIR, 43, IV, 14.  Shamshi-Adad, IR, 29, 5.  Neo-Bab. e. g. IIR, 37, 46 f.  Assyrian, e. g. CT, XIII, Pl. 9, I, 31.	
E. 4	  Sargon, unedited text in Louvre; cf. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Rec.</i> No. 41.  Gudea Cyl. A, XXIX, 12; Cyl. B, VIII, 8.  Assyrian, IIR, 5, 4c.  " IVR ² , 3, 70b.	 and 
E. 5	  Blau, Monument A, obv. V, 1.  TCI, No. 39, env. I, 9, II, 6 and 11.  " " 16, end, 1 and 4.  Gudea Cyl. A, VIII, 8, etc.  III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i> , No. 27, III, 9.  " HLC, Pl. 12, No. 52, obv. 16 and 19.  " " " 2, " 300, obv. 2.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXXVIII, 96.  Assyrian, e. g. IVR ² , 22, No. 2, 8.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Clay, <i>Murashu</i> , No. 106, 4.	
F. 1	  <i>Déc.</i> 1 ^{er} , No. 5, II, 3.  <i>Délégation</i> , II, 130.  Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{bis} , No. 2.  Manistusu, Face A, XIII, 22.  Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 5.  Gudea Statue, B, IV, 8.	
































F. 2		 Gudea Cyl. A, I, 25; cf. X, 16.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 9, I, 6.  " " " 23, No. 29, III, 13.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , I, 64, etc.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 178, 42.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 27, 31c.	
F. 3		 Blau, Monument B, 3.  Eannadu, Pl. 3 ^{bis} , E ¹ , III, 3.  Maništusu, Face A, XVI, 2.  Gudea Statue, B, VI, 26.  Gudea Cyl. A, II, 3, etc.  III Ur, HLC, Pl. 27, No. 186, 3.  " " " 40, I, 7.  " " " 28, No. 248, IV, 4.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXI, 10.  Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 27, rev. 6.  El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 7, rev. 15.  Cassite, Clay, XIV, 25, 8.  Nebuchad. I, II, 43.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 1, 59.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 82, 3.	
G. 1		 Archaic, CT, V, 3, II, 6.  Sargon, TCI, No. 39, env. I, 8.  Gudea Cyl. B, XIX, 9.  III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i> No. 114, I, 5.  " HLC, Pl. 18, No. 183, 1.  Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , IV, 42, 50, etc.  " <i>Letters</i> , No. 59, 7.  Cassite, Clay, XIV, List, No. 171.  Nebuchad. I, I, 7, etc.  Assyrian, e. g. Assurb. VR, 2, 93.  Neo-Bab. e. g. Strassm. <i>Nab.</i> No. 810, 6.	

	          	<p>Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, II, 12.</p> <p>TCI, No. 4, rev. I, 1.</p> <p>Manishtusu, Face A, XIII, 1.</p> <p>III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i>, No. 164¹², III, 12.</p> <p>Ur, HLC, Pl. 13, No. 44, 1.</p> <p>Gudea Cyl. A, II, 16.</p> <p>Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, II, 8, etc.</p> <p>El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 139.</p> <p>Neo-Bab. e. g. Cyrus, VR, 35, 4.</p> <p>Assyrian, e. g. Tig-Pil. I, IR, 9, 35.</p>	
G. 2*	    	<p>Manishtusu, Face A, XII, 25.</p> <p>Sargon, RTC, No. [77], rev. 2; TCI, No. 13, rev. 6.</p> <p>Gudea Statue, B, VI, 45.</p> <p>Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, XXII, 70.</p> <p>* For economy of space the full genealogy of this and the following signs is not given.</p>	
G. 3	   	<p>Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3, A, I, 11.</p> <p>Manishtusu, Face A, XI, 6.</p> <p>Gudea Statue, B, II, 10.</p> <p>Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, II, 10, etc.</p>	
G. 4	      	<p>Tablet <i>ψ</i>, I, 1.</p> <p>" " " 3.</p> <p><i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1^{bis}, No. 1a, III, 1.</p> <p>Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2^{ter}, No. 5, I, 6.</p> <p>Manishtusu, Face A, III, 4.</p> <p>Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 3.</p> <p>Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i>, II, 28, etc.</p>	
G. 5	   	<p><i>Délégation</i>, II, 130.</p> <p><i>Déc.</i> p. XXXVII, Nos. 7 and 8.</p> <p>Manishtusu, Face A, XI, 3 and 8.</p>	

G. 6			Blau, Monument, B, 2. Maništusu, Face D, XIX, 14.	
G. 7			Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> p. LI, No. 4, VIII, 4. Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3, A, I, 6, etc. " " p. XLIII, Galet A, VII, 8. Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 17. Maništusu, Face A, II, 15. III Ur, HLC, Pl. 25, I, 16. " " " 40, III, 6. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXXII, 50.	
G. 8			Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, [p. 19, III, 3. Epoch of Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> [p. XXXVII Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> p. LI, No. 4, XI, 26. Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, III, 29. OBI, No. 113, 5. III Ur, HLC, Pl. 6, No. 257, III, 7.	
H. 1			Archaic, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{ter} , No. 5, III, 3. Epoch of Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> p. XXXVII. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , e g. II, 23.	
H. 2			Archaic, <i>Délégation</i> , II, 130; Blau, Monument <i>Déc.</i> 1 ^{ter} , No. 6a. [B, 1; JAOS, XXIII, 19. Maništusu, Face A, II, 6, etc. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XIII, 32.	
H. 3			Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4 ^{ter} , F ¹ , I, 10. Eannadu, CT, IX, No. 85, 979, III, 2. Sargon, TCI, No. 32, rev. 5. III Ur, HLC, Pl. 26, I, 10.	
I. 1			Archaic, JAOS, XXIII, 19, III, 1. Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> p. LI, I, 6 and 10. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 1, etc.	

I. 2		Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{ter} , No. 4, 18. Maništusu, Face A, XIV, 22. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XVI, 29.	
I. 3		<i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{ter} , No. 5, IV, 3. Maništusu, Face A, VIII, 20. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 57; XVIII, 37, etc.	
I. 4		Archaic, JAOS, XXIII, 19, III, 1. Archaic, Blau, Monum't B; JAOS, XXII, 120. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXIII, 10.	
I. 5		Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 2 ^{bis} , No. 1. Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 3 ^{bis} , E ¹ , I, 27. III Ur, HLC, Pl. 9, I, 15.	
J. 1		Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, II, 2. TCI, No. 3, I, 5. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VII, 1.	
J. 2		Enšagkušanna, OBI, No. 93, 3. Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> 2 ^{bis} , No. 1, I, 1. TCI, No. 1, end, V, 1. Gudea Cyl. A, I, 10, etc.	
J. 3		Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, III, 21. " " " " " " (variant). III Ur, HLC, Pl. 46, IV, 1.	
J. 4		Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 35. Ur-kagina, <i>Déc.</i> p. L, V, 4. HLC, Pl. 23, No. 29, II, 10.	
J. 5		Ur-Nina, <i>Déc.</i> 2 ^{bis} , No. 2. Maništusu, Face A, II, 13. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XXXVIII, 66.	
J. 6		Archaic, JAOS, XXIII, 19, III, 1 (Hoffman Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> p. XLIV, No. 6, II, 7. [Tab.). Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 21.	

J. 7		Archaic, <i>Déc. Pl. 1^{bis}</i> , No. 1a, III, 4. Eannadu, <i>Déc. p. XLIII</i> , V, 12. Lugalzaggisi, OBI, No. 87, I, 9.	
J. 8		Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, I, 1. TCI, No. 3, II, 6. CT, V, Pl. 3, III, 4. Gudea Statue, B, I, 8.	
J. 9		Manishtusu, Face D, XII, 7. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XLII, 26. Nebuchad. I, VR, 55, 38.	
J. 10		Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, I, 3. Archaic, Blau, Monument A, rev. 1 (JAOS, XXII, 110). Gudea Cyl. A, XVIII, 20.	
J. 11		Archaic, <i>Déc. 1^{ter}</i> , No. 5, I, 2. Manishtusu, Face A, V, 8. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , II, 20.	
J. 12		Archaic, Blau, Monument A, obv. V, 3 (JAOS, XXII, 120). Archaic, OBI, No. 110, 18. Ur-Nina, <i>Déc. Pl. 2^{ter}</i> , No. 2, III, 6. Eannadu, <i>Déc. Pl. 4^{ter}</i> , subscription 2 and 3.	
J. 13		Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, I, 1. " <i>Déc. Pl. 1^{ter}</i> , No. 5, IV, 4. Ur-kagina, <i>Déc. p. LI</i> , VII, 3. Manishtusu, Face C, XXIII, 16. El-Amarna, Berlin, No. 181, 8.	
J. 14		Archaic, Blau, Monument A, obv. I, 3 (JAOS, XXII, 19). Archaic, Proto-Elamite, <i>Délé-</i> <i>gation</i> , VI, No. 364, 1. Gudea Statue, A, II, 1. " " F, III, 10. III Ur, Reisner, <i>Urkunden</i> , No. 126, I, 10.	

J. 15			Archaic, <i>Délégation</i> , II, 130.	
			Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 4, A, II, 3.	
			Manishtusu, Face C, III, 9.	
			Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , VI, 27, etc.	
K. 1	 	     	Archaic, Hoffman Tab. JAOS, XXIII, 19, I, 1. Archaic, unpublished tablet at Constant., cf. Thureau-Dangin, <i>Sup.</i> No. 363. Entemena, Silver vase 22 (<i>Déc.</i> Pl. 43bis). Manishtusu, Face C, XIV, 24. Sargon, TCI, No. 51, env. 10. Hammurabi, <i>Letters</i> , No. 91, 8.	
K. 2		 2 Eannadu, <i>passim</i> , cf. CT, VII, Pl. 1, I, 1, III, 3, etc.  III Ur, e. g. HLC, Pl. 12, No. 181, 2, etc.		
L. 1		   	Archaic, JAOS, XXIII, p. 19, II, 1 (Hoffman Tab.) Archaic, Blau, Monument B, 4 (JAOS, XXII, 120). Manishtusu, Face A, XIII, 9. Hammurabi, <i>Laws</i> , XVII, 9.	
L. 2		   	Archaic, <i>Déc.</i> Pl. 1 ^{er} , No. 6b, I, 7. Eannadu, <i>Déc.</i> p. XLIV, Galet, B. " " " XLIII, VIII, 4. Manishtusu, Face A, XII, 19.	

THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT OF THE
BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH

CHARLES PROSPERO FAGNANI

THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH

CHARLES PROSPERO FAGNANI

§ 1. THE SUPERScription, 1:1

דבר־יהוה אשר־היה אל־צפניה בן־כּושי בן־גדליה
בן־אמריה בן־חזקיה בימי יאשיהו בן־אמון מל
יהודה:

§ 2. THREATS OF JUDGMENT, 1:2—2:15

A. THE DAY OF YAHWEH WHICH CONFRONTS ISRAEL, 1:2-18

7 I הַסּ מִפְּנֵי * יְהוָה | כִּי־קָרֹב יוֹם יְהוָה
כִּי־הִכִּין יְהוָה זֶבַח | הַקֹּדֶשׁ קָרְאוּ:
* אֲדֹנִי

2 II אֶסֶף אֶסֶף¹ כָּל | מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה *
3 אֶסֶף¹ אָדָם וּבְהֵמָה | † עוֹף־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְדֹגֵי הַיָּם †
* נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה:
† אֶסֶף¹
‡ וְהִמְקֵשְׁלִים אֶת־הַרְשָׁעִים וְהִכְרַתִּי אֶת־הָאָדָם מֵעַל פְּנֵי
הָאֲדָמָה נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה:

4 III וְנָטִיתִי יָדִי עַל־יְהוּדָה | וְעַל * יוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם
וְהִכְרַתִּי † אֶת־שָׂאֵר הַבֶּעַל | וְאֶת־שֵׁם † הַכּוֹהֲנִים
* כָּל
‡ מִן הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה
‡ הַכֹּמְרִים עִם־

¹ אֶסֶף; as above, Gesenius-Kautzsch, 72aa; 113w, n. 3.

² וְהִמְקֵשְׁלִים; as above, Wellhausen.

³ אֶת; as above, *ibid.*

THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH

§ 1. THE SUPERScription, 1:1

The word of Yahweh which came to Zephaniah the son of Cushi, the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah, the son of Hezekiah, in the days of Josiah, the son of Amon, king of Judah.

§ 2. THREATS OF JUDGMENT, 1:2—2:15

A. THE DAY OF YAHWEH WHICH CONFRONTS ISRAEL, 1:2-18

- I 7 Hush before* Yahweh, for nigh is the day of Yahweh,
For Yahweh hath prepared a sacrifice, he has sanctified
his guests.

* the Lord

- II 2 I will completely take away everything from off the
face of the ground,*
3 I will take away man and beast,† the birds of heaven
and the fish of the sea.‡

* oracle of Yahweh

† I will take away

‡ and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked, and I will cut off
mankind from the face of the ground.

- III 4 And I will stretch out my hand against Judah, and
against* the inhabitants of Jerusalem,
And I will cut off† Baal to the last remnant, and the
(very) name of‡ the priests,

* all

† from this sanctuary

‡ the idolatrous priests with

- IV 5 ואת המשתחווים על-הגגות | לצבא השמים
 ואת המשתחווים* ליהוה | והנשבעים בְּמִלְכָּם:⁴
 *הנשבעים
- 6 ואת הנסוגים מאחרי יהוה ואשר לא-בקשו את-יהוה
 ולא-דרשהו:
- V 8a *ופקדתי על השרים | ועל-בית⁵ המלך
 9b הממלאים בית אדניהם | חמס ומרמה;
 *והיה ביום זבח יהוה
- VI 9a ופקדתי על כל- | הדולג על-המפתח*
 8b ועל כל הַלְבִּישׁ⁶ | מלבוש נכרי;
 *ביום ההוא
- VII 10 *קול צעקה משער הדגים | ויללה מן-המשנה
 11 ושיבר גדול מהגבעות: | וילִלָה מן-המכתש†
 *והיה ביום ההוא נאם יהוה
 †כי נדמה כל-עם כנען נכרתו כל-נטיילי כסה:
- VIII 12 *וְאַחֲפֹשׁ⁸ את-ירושלם בְּנֵר⁹ | ופקדתי על-הַשְׂאֲנָנִים¹⁰
 הקפאים על שמריהם | האמרים בלבבם
 *והיה בעת ההיא

⁴ אשׁ אשׁ בְּמִלְכָּם; as above, א 22. 36. 51. 95. 185. 238; S U, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti.

⁵ אשׁ אשׁ בְּנֵי; as above, א, G. A. Smith, Oort, Marti.

⁶ אשׁ אשׁ הַלְבִּישׁים.

⁷ אשׁ אשׁ וְהִילָלוּ וְשָׁבְרוּ; as above, Marti (possibly).

⁸ אשׁ אשׁ אַחֲפֹשׁ; as above, Nowack (probably).

⁹ אשׁ אשׁ בְּנֵרוֹת; as above, א.

¹⁰ אשׁ אשׁ הַשְׂאֲנָנִים; as above, Amos 6:1.

- IV 5 And those who worship on the house-tops the host of
 heaven,
 And those who worship* Yahweh, and (also) swear
 by Milcom;

*who swear

6 And those that turn back from after Yahweh, and those who have
 not sought Yahweh and have not inquired after him.

- V 8a *And I will punish the princes and the house of the king,
 9b Who fill the house of their lord with violence and deceit.

*And it shall come to pass in the day of Yahweh's sacrifice.

- VI 9a And I will punish all who leap upon the threshold,*
 8b And all who wear foreign apparel;

*in that day

- VII 10 *Hark! a cry from the Fish Gate, and a wailing from
 the New Quarter,
 11 And a great clamor from the hills, and a wailing from
 Makhtesh.†

*And it shall come to pass in that day, oracle of Yahweh

†For all the traffickers are destroyed, all those laden with money
 are cut off.

- VIII 12 *And I will search Jerusalem with a lamp, and I will
 punish those who are at ease,
 Who are thickened upon their lees, who are saying to
 themselves,

*And it shall come to pass at that time

- IX לא ייטיב יהוה | ולא ירע;
 13a והיה חילם למשסה | ובתיהם לשממה
 13b ובנו בתים ולא ישבו ונטעו כרמים ולא־ישחו את־ייונם:
- X 14 קרוב יומי¹¹ הגדול | קרוב ומִמֶּהָר¹² מאד
 קָרֹב¹³ יומי¹¹ הַמָּוֶה¹⁴ | צרה שם גבור;
- XI 15a, b יום עברה היום ההוא | יום צרה ומצוקה
 15d, e יום חשך ואפלה | יום ענן וערפל;
- XII 15c, 16 יום שאה ומשואה¹⁵ | יום שופר ותרועה
 על הערים הבצרות | ועל הפנות הגבהות:
- XIII 17 והציתי לאדם | והלכנו כעורים*
 ושפך דמם כעפר | ולחמם כגללים:
 *כי ליהוה חטאו
- XIV 18 גִּם־נִסְפָּם גִּם־זֶהָבָם | לֹא־יוֹכַל לְהַצִּילָם
 [כי¹⁶] ביום עֲבָרְתִּי¹⁷ ובאש קִנְאֹתִי¹⁸ | תֹּאכַל כְּלִי־הָאָרֶץ*
 *כי כלה אֶךְ־נִבְהִלָה יַעֲשֶׂה אֶת כְּלִי־שְׁבִי הָאָרֶץ:

¹¹ מִמֶּהָר; as above, Marti (perhaps).

¹² מִמֶּהָר; as above, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti.

¹³ מִמֶּהָר; as above, Marti, Nowack (perhaps).

¹⁴ מִמֶּהָר; as above, Nowack, Marti.

¹⁵ Transpose 15c; so Marti.

¹⁶ Not in מִמֶּהָר.

¹⁷ מִמֶּהָר יהוה.

¹⁸ מִמֶּהָר קנאתו.

- IX "Yahweh is no help, neither is he a hindrance."
13a Their riches will become a prey and their houses a
 desolation.
 13b And they shall build houses and not inhabit (them),
 And plant vineyards and not drink the wine thereof.
- X 14 Near is my great day, near and hastening exceedingly;
 Near is my bitter day, the mighty man there will cry
 aloud.
- XI 15 A day of wrath is that day, a day of trouble and of
 distress,
 A day of darkness and murk, a day of clouds and thick
 darkness,
- XII 15c, 16 A day of destruction and desolation, a day of trumpets
 and battle cries,
 Against the fortified cities, and against the lofty battle-
 ments.
- XIII 17 And I will bring anguish upon men, and they will walk
 as the blind,*
 And their blood will be poured out as dust, and their
 bowels (?) as dung.
 *because against Yahweh they have sinned
- XIV 18 Neither their silver nor their gold will be able to deliver
 them,
 For in the day of my wrath and in the fire of my jealousy
 the whole earth will be devoured.*
 *for a complete destruction will he make of all the inhabitants of
 the earth.

B. THE JUDGMENTS AGAINST THE NATIONS, 2:1-15

- 1 I
הַחֲבִיִּשׁוּ וְבוֹשׁוּ¹⁹ | הַגּוֹי לֹא נִכְסָה:
בְּטָרִם תִּהְיוּ²⁰ | כִּמְץ עֲבִיר^{*21} 2a
- *יּוֹם
- 2b, c
בְּטָרִם לֹא־יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם יוֹם אֱלֹהִיָּה
בְּטָרִם לֹא־יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם יוֹם אֱלֹהִיָּה
- 3
בְּקִשׁוֹ אֶת־יְהוָה כָּל־עַמִּי²³ הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר מִשְׁפָּטוֹ פָּעִל
בְּקִשׁו־צֶדֶק בְּקִשׁוֹ עֲנֵה אוֹלֵי תַסְתֵּרוּ בְּיוֹם אֱלֹהִיָּה:
- 4 II
כִּי־עֲזָה עֲזוּבָה תִּהְיֶה | וְאִשְׁקִלּוֹן לִשְׂמִמָּה
אֲשֶׁדּוּד בְּצִהָרִים יִגְרֹשׁוּ | וְעַקְרוֹן תַּעֲקֹר:
- 5a III
הוּי יִשְׁבִּי חֶבֶל הַיָּם | גּוֹי כְּרָתִים*
וְהָאֲבֵד־תִּיד מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב | אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים²⁴ 5d, c
- *דִּבְר־יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם 5b
†כִּנְעַן
- 6 IV
וְהָיִיתָ*²⁵ נִיָּה †²⁶ רַעִים | וּגְדֵרוֹת צֶאֱן:
עַל־הָיִים²⁷ יִרְעוּן | בְּבִתְּיָם †²⁸ בְּעֶרֶב יִרְבְּצוּן 7b
- *חֶבֶל הַיָּם
†כֶּרֶת
†אִשְׁקִלּוֹן
- 7a
וְהָיָה חֶבֶל [הַיָּם] לִשְׂאֵרֵי בֵּית יְהוּדָה
כִּי יִפְקֹדֵם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְשֶׁבֶתָם שְׁבוֹתָם²⁹ 7c
- 19 אִשְׁט; הַחֲבִיִּשׁוּ וְקוֹשׁוּ; as above, Graetz, Cheyne, Budde, Nowack, Driver.
20 אִשְׁט; לָדַת חֹק; as above, א.
21 אִשְׁט; עֲבִיר; as above, א, Graetz, Wellhausen, Oort, Nowack, Marti, Driver.
22 אִשְׁט; חֲרוֹן; corrected by יוֹם at the end of 2a.
23 אִשְׁט; עֲנִי; as above suggested by A. B. Ehrlich.
24 אִשְׁט; וְהָאֲבֵד־תִּיד כִּנְעַן אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים precedes; as above, Nowack, Marti.
25 אִשְׁט; וְהָיִיתָ; as above, Marti. 26 אִשְׁט; נִיָּה; as above, Driver.
27 אִשְׁט; עַל־הַיָּם; as above, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Oort, Nowack, Marti, Driver.
28 אִשְׁט; בְּבִתְּיָם. 29 Qer6; שְׁבוֹתָם.

B. THE JUDGMENTS AGAINST THE NATIONS, 2:1-15

- I 1 Be ashamed before one another, yea be ashamed, O nation unabashed,
 2a Before ye become as flying chaff.*
 * day
 2b, c Before the day of the anger of Yahweh come upon you,
 Before the day of the anger of Yahweh come upon you.
 3 Seek ye Yahweh, all ye nations of the earth, ye who execute his purpose, seek righteousness, seek meekness, perhaps ye may be hidden in the day of the wrath of Yahweh.
- II 4 For Gaza shall be forsaken, and Ashkelon a desolation,
 Ashdod shall be driven forth at noonday, and Eqrone shall be rooted up.
- III 5a Woe to the inhabitants of the sea-coasts, the people of the Cherethites,*
 5a, c I will destroy thee (so as to be) without an inhabitant, †land of the Philistines.
 5b *the word of Yahweh against you
 †Canaan
- IV 6 Thou wilt become *the dwelling† of shepherds, and folds for flocks,
 7b By the sea they will feed, in the houses‡ in the evening they will lie down
 * the sea-coast
 † . . .
 ‡ Ashkelon
 7a And the sea-coast shall be for the remnant of the house of Judah
 7c For Yahweh their God will visit them, and restore their prosperity.

JUDGMENT UPON MOAB AND AMMON, 2:8-11

8 I שמעתי חרפת מואב | וגדפי בני עמון
אשר חרפו את-עמי | ויגדילו על גבולי;³⁰

9 II לכן חי-אני נאם יהוה צבאות | אלהי ישראל
כי מואב כסדם תהיה | ובני עמון כעמרה

III ממשק חרול ומזרה³¹ מלח | ושממה עד עולם
שאריה עמי יבזום | ויתר גויי³² ינחלוס:

10 זאת להם תחת גאונם כי חרפו ויגדלו על-עם יהוה
צבאות:

11 נורא יהוה עליהם כי יזרה³³ את כל-אלהי הארץ
וישתחוו-לו איש ממקומו כל אי הגוים:

12 V גם אתם כושים | חללי חרבי*

13 וְאַטְּ³⁴ יָדֶי³⁵ עַל-צָפוֹן | וְאַאֲבֹד³⁶ אֶת-אֲשׁוּר

*המה:

וְאֲשִׁים³⁷ אֶת-נִינוֹה לְשִׁמְמָה | צִיָּה כַּמְדָּבָר;
14 וּרְבָצוּ בְּתוֹכָה עֲדָרִים | כֹּל חֵיתוֹ-גֹּי

VII
גַּם קָאֵת גַּם-קֶפֶד | בַּכְּפֹתֶיהָ יִלִּינוּ
כֹּסִם³⁸ יִשׁוּרֵר בַּחֲלוֹן | עֵרֵב³⁹ בִּסְסָ*
*כי ארזה ערה:

³⁰ אט גבולם; as above, א, Nowack, Marti.

³¹ אט ומכרה; as above, A. B. Ehrlich.

גוי.

³³ אט יזרה; as above, Graetz.

³⁴ אט ויט; as above, Marti.

³⁵ אט יד; as above, Marti.

³⁶ אט ויאבד; as above, Marti.

³⁷ אט וישם; as above, Marti.

³⁸ אט קול; as above, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Driver.

³⁹ אט הרב; as above, א, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Oort, Nowack, Marti, Driver.

JUDGMENT UPON MOAB AND AMMON, 2:8-11

- I 8 I have heard the reproach of Moab and the revilings of the sons of Ammon
With which they reproach my people, and magnify themselves against my border.
- II 9 Therefore, as I live, oracle of Yahweh of Hosts, God of Israel, Surely Moab shall become like Sodom, and the sons of Ammon like Gomorrah;
- III A possession (?) of nettles and a place sown with salt, yea, a desolation forever;
The remnant of my people shall plunder them, and the remainder of my nation shall inherit them.
- 10 This shall they have for their pride, because they have reproached and magnified themselves against the people of Yahweh of Hosts.
- 11 Yahweh will be terrible unto them for he will scatter all the gods of the earth and all the lands of the nations shall worship him each from his sanctuary.
- v 12 Ye Ethiopians also shall be slain by my sword;
And I will turn my hand toward the north and destroy Assyria;
- vi And I will make Nineveh a desolation, parched as the wilderness,
- 14 And all gregarious animals will lie down in her midst in flocks.
- vii Both the pelican and the porcupine shall lodge in the capitals thereof,
Owls shall hoot in the windows, ravens on the thresholds.*

*For he hath laid bare the cedar-work (?).

15 זאת העיר העליזה | היושבת לבטח
האמרה בלבבה אני | ואפסי עוד
איך היתה לשמה | מרבץ לחיה
כל עובר עליה ישרק | יניע ידו:

§ 3. ADDITIONS BY OTHER HANDS

A. ARRAIGNMENT OF JERUSALEM, 3:1-7

1 הוי מוֹרָה⁴⁰ | ונגאלה | העיר היונה: I
2 לא שמיִעָה בקול | לא לקחה מוסר
ביהוה לא בטחה | אל־אלוהיה לא קרבה:

3 שריה בקרבה | אריות שאגים [הִמָּה]^{40a} II
שפטיה זאבי ערב* | 4 נביאיה פחזים †
כהניה חללו קדש | חמסו תורה:
*לא גרמו לבקר:
†אנשי בגדות

5 יהוה צדיק בקרבה | לא יעשה עולה III
בבקר בבקר משפטו | [הוא] יתן
אור⁴¹ לא נעדר | ולא־נוֹדַע⁴² עֵקֶל*⁴³
בשת:

6 הכרתי גוים | נשמו פנוחם IV
החרבתי חוצותם | מבלי עובר
נצדו עריהם* | מאין יושב:
*מבלי־איש

⁴⁰ מוֹרָה.

^{40a} From 2:12.

⁴² וְנוֹדַע; as above, Marti.

⁴¹ לְאוֹר; as above, Marti.

⁴³ עֵקֶל; as above, Marti.

- 15 This the joyous city, that dwelt securely,
That said to herself I am, and there is none beside.
How has she become a desolation, a lair for beasts;
Everyone that passes by her hisses, and wags his hand.

§ 3. ADDITIONS BY OTHER HANDS

A. ARRAIGNMENT OF JERUSALEM, 3:1-7

- I 1 Woe to the rebellious and polluted one, the oppressing
 city;
 2 She has not obeyed the voice, she has not received
 instruction;
 In Yahweh she has not trusted, to her God she has not
 drawn near.
- II 3 Her princes in her midst are roaring lions;
 Her judges evening wolves,* 4 her prophets boastful
 persons,†
 Her priests profane that which is holy, do violence to
 the Torah.
 *they have left nothing till morning
 †treacherous men
- III 5 Yahweh is righteous in the midst of her, he does naught
 wrong;
 Morning by morning he sets his decree,
 Light fails not, an oversight is unknown.*
 *shame.
- IV 6 I have cut off nations, their battlements are desolated;
 I have made their streets waste, so that none passeth by;
 Their cities are destroyed, so that there is* no inhabitant.
 *so that there is no man.

7 V אמרתי אך-תִּירָא⁴⁴ אותי | תִּקַּח⁴⁵ מוֹסֵר
ולא-יכרת מִעֵינֶיהָ⁴⁶ | כל אשר פקדתי עליה
אכן השכימו השחיתו | כל עלילותם:

B. THE DELIVERANCE OF JERUSALEM IN THE DAY OF THE JUDGMENT
OF THE NATIONS, 3: 8-13

8 I לכן חֲכִי-לִי נאם-יהוה | ליום קומי לְעֵד⁴⁸
כי משפטי לאסֶה גוים | לְקַבֵּץ⁴⁹ מַמְלָכוֹת
לשפך עליהם זַעְמִי | כל חֲרוֹן אִפִּי
כי באש קנאתי | תאכל כל-הָאָרֶץ:

9 כי אז אהפך אֶל-עַמִּים | שְׁפָה בְרוּרָה
לקרא כלם בְּשִׁמִּי⁵⁰ | לַעֲבֹדִי⁵¹ שְׂכָם אֶחָד:
10 מעבר לנהרי כּוֹשׁ* יובלֹון מִנְחָתִי:

* עֲתָרִי בַת-פְּרוּצִי

11 II ביום ההוא לא תבושי | מִכָּל עֲלִילוֹתֶיךָ*
כִּי-אֵז אֲסִיר מִקִּרְבְּךָ | עֲלִיזִי גֵאוֹתְךָ
ולא-תוֹסֶפִי לַגְּבָהָה עוֹד | בַּחֵר קִדְשִׁי:
12a והשארתי בִּקְרִבְךָ | עִם עַנִּי וְדָל
* אֲשֶׁר פִּשְׁעֵתִי בִּי

⁴⁴ H T תִּירָא; as above, Oort, Nowack, Marti.

⁴⁵ H T תִּקַּח; as above, Oort, Nowack, Marti.

⁴⁶ H T מִעֵינֶיהָ; as above, G S, G. A. Smith, Oort, Nowack, Marti, Driver.

⁴⁷ H T חֲכִי; as above, G, Marti.

⁴⁸ H T לְעֵד; as above, G S, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti.

⁴⁹ H T לְקַבֵּץ; as above, G S, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti.

⁵⁰ H T בְּשִׁמִּי.

⁵¹ H T לַעֲבֹדִי.

- v 7 I thought surely she will fear me, she will accept
instruction,
And nothing shall fade from her eyes that I have
commanded her,
But they diligently corrupted all their doings.

B. THE DELIVERANCE OF JERUSALEM IN THE DAY OF THE JUDGMENT
OF THE NATIONS, 3:8-13

- I 8 Therefore wait thou for me, oracle of Yahweh, until the
day of my rising up as witness;
For my decree is to gather nations, to assemble king-
doms,
To pour out upon them my wrath, all the fierceness of
my anger,
For by the fire of my jealousy shall all the earth be
devoured.

9 For then will I bestow on the peoples pure lips,
That all of them may call upon my name to serve me with one
consent;
From beyond the rivers of Cush* they will bring me offerings.

*

- II 11 In that day thou shalt not be put to shame because of
all thy doings;*
For then will I take away from thy midst thy proudly
exulting ones,
And thou shalt no more be haughty in my holy mountain,
12a And I will leave in thy midst as a people the humbled
and poor.

*wherein thou hast transgressed against me

12b, 13 III וחסו בשם יהוה | שארית ישראל
לא יעשו עולה | ולא ידברו כזב
ולא ימצא בפיהם | לשון תרמית
כי־המה ירעו ורבעו | ואין מחריד:

C. THE GLORY OF REDEEMED JERUSALEM, 3:14-19

14 I רני בת ציון | הריעו ישראל
שמחי ועלזי בכל־לב | בת ירושלם:

15 II הִסִּיר יְהוָה מִשְׁפָּטָיו: 52 | פִּנָּה אִיבִיךָ 53
מֶלֶךְ * יְהוָה בִּקְרֹבךָ | לֹא־תִרְאִי 54 רֵעַ עוֹד:
*ישראל

16 ביום ההוא יאמר לירושלם אל־תיראי ציון אל־ירפו ידיך:

17 III יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בִּקְרֹבךָ | גִּבּוֹר יוֹשִׁיעַ
יִשִּׁישׁ עִלְיֶיךָ בְּשִׂמְחָה: * | יִגִּיל † בְּרִנָּה:
*יחריש באהבתו
†עליך

52 מִשְׁפָּטָיו; as above, Wellhausen, Nowack, Oort, Marti.

53 אִיבִיךָ; as above, Wellhausen, Marti.

54 תִּרְאִי; as above, MSS Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Oort, Nowack, Marti.

- III 12^b, 13 And the remnant of Israel will take refuge in the name
of Yahweh;
They will not do iniquity nor speak lies;
And there shall not be found in their mouth a tongue
of deceit;
Yea they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make
them afraid.

C. THE GLORY OF REDEEMED JERUSALEM, 3:14-19

- I 14 Sing O daughter of Zion, shout O Israel;
Rejoice and be glad with all thy heart, O daughter of
Jerusalem.
- II 15 Yahweh hath taken away thine adversaries, hath re-
moved thine enemies;
Yahweh is King* in the midst of thee, thou shalt not
see evil any more.

*of Israel

- 16 In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, Fear not Zion, let not
thy hands be weak.

- III 17 Yahweh thy God is in the midst of thee, a victorious
hero;
He rejoices over thee with gladness,* he exults† with
singing.

*he is silent in his love

†over thee

18 *הִירָ 56 מִי 57 יִשָּׂא 58 | עֲלֶיךָ 59 חֲרָפָה ;
 19 הִנְנִי עֹשֶׂה [כָּלָה 59] | אֶת־כָּל מַעֲנִיךָ †
 * כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד 55 אֲסַפְתִּי מִמֶּךָ
 † בַּעַת הֵיחָא :

IV

וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּי אֶת 60 הַצִּלְעָה | וְהִנְדַּחְתָּ אֶקֶבֶץ
 וּשְׂמִתִּים לַתְּהוֹלָה וּלְשֵׁם | בְּכָל־[עַמִּי] הָאָרֶץ *
 * בַּשָּׁתִּם : 61

V

20 בַּעַת הֵיחָא אֲבִיָּא אַתְכֶם * כִּי־אַתֶּן אַתְכֶם לְשֵׁם וּלְתִהְלָה
 בְּכָל עַמִּי הָאָרֶץ בְּשׁוּבִי אֶת־שְׁבוּתְכֶם 63 לְעִינֵיכֶם אֲמַר
 יְהוָה :

* וּבַעַת [הֵיחָא] אֶקֶבֶץ 62 אַתְכֶם

55 אֲסַפְתִּי מִמֶּךָ ; as above, &S, Oort, Nowack.

56 אֶקֶבֶץ ; as above, &S, Oort, Nowack.

57 מִשָּׂאָה ; as above, &S, Nowack.

58 אֶעֱלֶיךָ ; as above, Oort.

59 So Graetz, Nowack, Marti.

60 אֶת־.

61 Probably for בְּשׁוּבִי שְׁבוּתְכֶם, Wellhausen, Marti.

62 קִבְּצִי.

63 שְׁבוּתֵיכֶם ; as above, &S, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Marti.

- IV 18 Woe! whosoever lifts up a reproach against thee;*
 19 Lo I will make [a destruction] of all afflicting thee;†

 *as in a day of festival I will gather from thee

 †at that time

- v And I will save that which is lame, and gather the
 dispersed;
 And I will make them a praise and a name among all
 the peoples of the earth.*

 *when I restore their prosperity

- 20 In that time I will bring you* for I will make you a name and a
 praise among all the peoples of the earth, when I restore your
 prosperity before your eyes, saith Yahweh.

 *and in [that] time I will gather you

AN OMEN SCHOOL TEXT

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

AN OMEN SCHOOL TEXT

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

The better knowledge that we now have of the remarkable collection made by King Ašurbanapal (668–626 B. C.) in his royal palace at Nineveh, thanks largely to Bezold's monumental work,¹ has brought out the significant fact that a considerable proportion of the specifically Babylonian section² consists of texts that formed part of the equipment of the temple schools of Babylonia and more particularly of the school attached to Marduk's temple in Babylon.³ This applies not merely to the distinctively school texts, such as sign lists, syllabaries, word lists, grammatical and lexicographical exercises,⁴ but also to the literary productions and practice tablets based on such productions;⁵ to the ritual texts which served as a means of instructing the young aspirants to the priesthood in the complicated ritual⁶ for the various occasions when the services of the priests were required, and to the collections of omens of all kinds—constituting one of the largest sections in the royal library. Such texts, while they may also be regarded as guides and reference works for full-fledged priests in the interpretation of omens observed, appear to have been prepared primarily for the purposes of the temple schools.⁷ The same is true of the mathematical and metrological tablets, and it is probably

¹ *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum* (5 vols., London, 1889–99).

² On the Assyrian section of the library which is more extensive than generally supposed, see the writer's paper "Did the Babylonian Temples have Libraries?" *JAOS*, XXVII, pp. 175 ff.

³ Jastrow, *ibid.*, p. 178.

⁴ Bezold, *loc. cit.*, Index, pp. 2093–98.

⁵ See the examples of such commentaries and practice tablets in King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, Vol. I, pp. 157–81; Jastrow, "A Babylonian Parallel to Job," *JSBL*, XXV, p. 144; Bezold, *loc. cit.*, Index, pp. 2099–2100; and Weber, *Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrier*, pp. 294–96.

⁶ Specimens in Zimmern's *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*, Vol. II, "Ritualtafeln für den Wahrsager, Beschwörer und Sänger." The Šamaš-Adad series of ritualistic texts of which Zimmern, *loc. cit.*, pp. 190–219, gives some specimens belong to the same general category. See Bezold, *loc. cit.*, Index, p. 2153.

⁷ On these omen-texts and collections registered by Bezold in his Index under "Forecasts," pp. 2011–30, and "Omens," pp. 2139–49, see Jastrow, *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Vol. II, pp. 203–13, and the literature there referred to.

an accident that among the fragments of the Nineveh collection this section is not more largely represented.⁸ One is inclined to place in the category of school texts also the bilingual literary texts in Ašurbanapal's library, such as the numerous prayers and myths, hymns and incantations, including both those in which the Sumerian represents the original, and those in which the Sumerian is a translation from the Semitic original. In the former case,

⁸E. g., IV R. 37, and Bezold, *loc. cit.*, Index, p. 2111. Specimens of Babylonian originals of mathematical calculations also in *CT*, IX, 8-13 and 14-15. See Weber, *loc. cit.*, p. 299. See, however, Pinches, *JRAS*, 1907, p. 707, from which it would appear that the British Museum has among its unpublished treasures more tablets of this class. At Sippar, Scheil found quite a number of such metrological and mathematical tablets (*Une saison de fouilles à Sippar*, Cairo, 1903) which are treated by him in chap. iii of his work under the proper designation of "L'École à Sippar" (pp. 30-54). At Nippur, Peters and Haynes found exactly the same kind of mathematical and metrological tablets, only in larger numbers, so that our knowledge of this subdivision of the Babylonian school texts is considerably increased through the recent publication of forty-six tablets and fragments by Hilprecht. The title of the publication, however, *Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Tablets from the Temple Library of Nippur* (Philadelphia, 1906) is a misnomer. A glance at the texts in this volume suffices to show that *all* except the last—a chronological list that *may* have formed part of a private archive or of a temple business archive—are *school texts pure and simple*. Three of them, for example, contain on the one side syllabaries (Nos. 23, 24, 37) and on the other multiplication tables and measures of capacity—the certain ear-marks of school exercises. Again, on one (No. 20) the exercise is written in one column by the teacher and in a second repeated by the pupil. Mixed and repeated exercises appear on some (e. g., Nos. 20, 21, rev.), while practice strokes are to be seen on others (e. g., Nos. 10, 32, 40). Hilprecht is obliged to admit (p. x) that these are "textbooks," but converts them into "temple library" texts by the assertion that they were "*afterwards* deposited in the Temple Library"! When "*afterwards*"? Apart from the fact that there is not a particle of evidence for this gratuitous supposition, it assumes the existence of a sufficient number of distinctively "literary" texts to warrant us in speaking of a "temple library." Since, however, the evidence for this assumption hitherto presented turns out to be elusive—being based on tablets that were *not* excavated at Nippur, and such objects as were *not* found on the site of the supposed "temple library"—an earnest protest must be entered against the unwarranted use of the words "temple library" in the title of the volume in question which is calculated only to make scholars more determined in their uncompromising attitude toward methods that involve, as has recently been said, "a disregard of the simplest ethical standards." Before scholars can be convinced that the temple at Nippur harbored a great library collection comparable to that which Ašurbanapal gathered in his palace—*not in a temple*—unimpeachable evidence must be furnished for the existence of a *sufficient* number of hymns, prayers, incantations, omens, and myths, as well as medical and astronomical texts—and such as are not school texts—to justify the use of so well-defined a term as "library." If, however, after waiting patiently for more than seven years nothing but school texts and administrative archives, valuable though these are, are laid before us, the question must perforce be raised whether the temple at Nippur ever possessed extensive literary treasures. As a working hypothesis we are forced to assume that the temple archives in Babylonia were limited as a rule to collections of business records and to school texts of a miscellaneous character, among which we should of course expect to find the ritual texts used in connection with the cult—not, however, a large collection gathered as was Ašurbanapal's library from a *variety* of sources. See—in addition to the writer's paper "Did the Babylonian Temple have Libraries?"—Bezold's remarks in the *Literarisches Centralbl.*, 1907, p. 483, for additional reasons against regarding the tablets found by Peters and Haynes at Nippur as a "temple library" and also Ungnad's strictures on the term "Temple Library" in the *Zeits. d. Deutsch. morg. Gesell.*, Vol. 61, pp. 705-06.

the Semitic translation is added to initiate the pupil into an understanding of the older sacred tongue; in the latter, the Semitic original is added to insure the correct understanding of the Sumerian translation. The medical texts of which specimens have recently been published by Kùchler⁹ may also have been prepared for purposes of instruction in prescribing the remedies to be applied in connection with the incantation rites for releasing sufferers from the grasp of the demons who were regarded as the ultimate source of physical suffering, though, at the same time, these texts no doubt served, like the collections of omens, as guides for those who, as priests in active service, were called upon to administer to the sick. Further investigation of this class of texts will probably show that we must distinguish between medical handbooks and medical school texts based on these handbooks, just as in the case of omens, we have, as will be shown presently, "official" as well as "school" editions of the collections of omens compiled by bārû-priests.

The school texts in the royal library at Nineveh, reverting to originals that once formed part of the equipment of the schools attached to the temples in the south,¹⁰ thus assume large dimensions. They throw an interesting light on the pedagogical methods pursued in Babylonia, which no doubt were closely followed in Assyria, and we must be prepared to find all manner of helps that were devised to facilitate the understanding of the various branches of the religious literature of Babylonia—and that literature is largely, if not almost exclusively, religious—by means of which the temple pupils were enabled to penetrate into the intricacies of the cult, and into the very essence of the lore which was an outcome of the religious beliefs and tendencies prevailing in the Euphrates valley. Already, we may distinguish a considerable variety of such helps among the textbook division of Ašurbanapal's library. The grammatical and phrase exercises appear to have been prepared chiefly for training pupils in draw-

⁹ *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der assyrisch-babylonischen Medizin*, Leipzig, 1904.

¹⁰ A proof of the continued existence of these schools at Borsippa, Babylon, and Sippar to very late days is furnished by syllabaries and lexicographical lists dated in the reigns of Persian kings (e. g., *CT*, XII, 3, 7, 9, 17, 37) and by such a collection as Reisner's *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen aus griechischer Zeit*. See Jastrow's *Did the Babylonian Temples have Libraries?* p. 167.

ing up business and legal documents.¹¹ The list of gods and stars were drawn, presumably, as helps for the study of astronomy in connection with omen-texts; the elaborate lists of names of plants^{12a} may have been prepared in connection with the study of incantations and medical remedies, and so forth, for other branches of study. For the elucidation of literary texts, we have, besides the bilinguals,¹³ commentaries arranged on the principle of picking out difficult terms and phrases and explaining them by such as were in more common use.¹⁴ In the case of the commentaries to the story of creation, King has found no less than three different kinds.¹⁵ Again, at times glosses were merely introduced into the texts themselves.¹⁶ All this warrants the conclusion that the helps varied according to the class of texts selected for study. Correspondingly, for each class certain kinds of helps were developed that were best adapted for the character of the class and for the purpose or purposes aimed at.

The interpretation of omens constituting one of the most important functions of the priests, it is not surprising that a variety of devices were developed, which were calculated to illustrate both the method followed in the interpretation of omens and the two fundamental theses underlying the science of divination, namely (1) that occurrences on earth were paralleled by accompanying phenomena in the heavens, leading to omens based on the observation of the sun, moon, planets, and stars, and (2) that through the liver of the sacrificial animal—usually a sheep—as the seat of the soul—and therefore as the divine organ—coming events could be divined, leading to an elaborate system of hepatoscopy.¹⁷

¹¹ See Weber, *loc. cit.*, pp. 291, 292.

¹² E. g., II R. 49 and 54-59; III R. 67-69; and Bezold, *Catalogue*, Index, pp. 2094-95.

^{12a} *CT*, XIV, 18-49.

¹³ Weber, *loc. cit.*, p. 292, n. 1, properly calls attention to "bilinguals" arranged in parallel columns as II R. 17, 18 as certainly prepared for school purposes, and I believe this to be the case also with the other class of bilinguals arranged in interlinear form.

¹⁴ V R. 47 to the text IV R. 60*.

¹⁵ King, *loc. cit.*, and Weber, *loc. cit.*, p. 296.

¹⁶ So, e. g., in omen collections *CT*, XX, 14, 25, 27, 48. For the latter see Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts," *AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 109 ff.

¹⁷ For details the reader is referred to the writer's *Religion Babylonians und Assyriens* (referred to in this article as Jastrow, *Religion*), chap. xx (Lieferungen 10, 11, and 12). I exclude the large class of "signs and portents" (birth-portents, dreams, all kinds of unusual occurrences, accidents, and so forth) which should be differentiated from "omens" proper.

Confining ourselves to the second class of omens, attention has already been drawn¹⁸ to glosses in the text which show distinctly that they were drawn up primarily for instruction and elucidation in the temple schools. A second device was the use of illustrations of parts of the liver introduced in the texts, or of phenomena on the liver.¹⁹ Of these quite a number are known and of special significance is the clay model of a sheep's liver (*CT*, VI, 1) showing the chief parts of the liver and covered with omens designed to illustrate the system followed in the interpretation. A third species of helps is represented by an interesting text that might be designated as an "Introduction to the study of the principles of Hepatoscopy," since its main purpose is to illustrate the connection between the signs observed on the liver of a sacrificial animal and the interpretation assigned to it.

The general character of this text as a help in the elucidation of the methods followed in the interpretation of omens was recognized many years ago by Delitzsch,²⁰ though it was not possible for him, because of the imperfect state of our knowledge of this branch of the Babylonian-Assyrian literature, to determine at the time what is now clear, that the omens referred to are specifically such as are derived from the inspection of the liver of the sacrificial animal. Moreover, Delitzsch had at his disposal merely a fragment of the text²¹ and he was naturally misled into regarding Cols. I and II as containing synonyms. It was equally natural that he was followed in this view by Muss-Arnolt who in his invaluable *Assyrian Dictionary* (1905) enters the words of these two columns, as Delitzsch did in his *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (1896), as synonyms.²² A duplicate fragment of the text was pub-

¹⁸ See above, p. 284, n. 16.

¹⁹ Thus *CT*, XX, 28 obv. and rev. we have illustrations (1) of the hepatic duct (GIR = niptū) with its subsidiary branches and (2) of "splits" within the hepatic duct. Again Boissier, *Choix de Textes relatifs à la Divination Assyro-babylonienne*, Vol. I, pp. 139-43; also pp. 118 and 153 furnish the various forms assumed by a certain species of markings on the liver known as zibē, "clubs," on which see Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts" (*AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 103 ff.). In the same way a tablet published by Boissier, *Documents Assyriens relatifs aux Présages*, pp. 36-40 (with plate), contains illustrations of the *processus pyramidalis*, etc. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 218, n. 3.

²⁰ *Assyrisches Wörterbuch* (1890), p. 481 (n. 8). ²¹ K. 4416 published II R. 43, No. 1.

²² E. g., Muss-Arnolt, p. 46a (aliktum), 122a (uššurtum), 367a (kabartu) corresponding to Delitzsch, pp. 69a, 312b, and 315a, and so throughout the text. Meissner in his *Supplement zu den assyrischen Wörterbüchern* does the same, e. g., 54b (larū), 47 (ku-ul-tum), where instead of II R he has accidentally written V. R, etc., etc.

lished in 1894 by Boissier²³ but it was not until 1904 that by a combination of six fragments representing at least three independent copies, a more complete edition of this important text was issued through which it was possible to determine definitely its more precise character.²⁴

Unfortunately, the text is still far from complete. It consisted originally of six columns, three on the obverse, and three on the reverse; those on the obverse consisting of some forty lines each and those on the reverse of thirty-two lines each, so that in its complete form the tablet covered at least two hundred and twenty lines, and probably close to two hundred and fifty lines. According to the colophon attached to one of the fragments,²⁵ the tablet is the first of a series known as *šumma multabiltum*.²⁶ We are fortunate in possessing a list of the opening lines of the seventeen tablets of which the series consisted and which show that the entire series was devoted to hepatoscopy. Parts of the second, third, fourth, twelfth, and thirteenth tablets of this series have also been published by Mr. R. C. Thompson,²⁷ and from these it follows that

²³ K. 2235 in *Documents Assyriens*, pp. 80-82.

²⁴ *CT*, XX, 39-42 (KK. 2235, 4416, and 4585; Rm. 2, 466 and Bu. 89-4-26, 168). Bezold's supposition (*Catalogue*, p. 427) that K. 2263 may form part of the tablet in question to which K. 2235 belongs can now be corrected, since it turns out that the tablet belongs to another series. A fragment of a neo-Babylonian duplicate (K. 4432) is also included in *CT*.

²⁵ Bu. 89-4-26, 168.

²⁶ The line probably to be completed according to K. 3837 (Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 45, 1) of which KK. 2434, 7628, and 8289 are duplicates (cf. also K. 4013) and KK. 1999 (Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 37) and 2089 (Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 118) as follows: *šumma multabiltum ušurāti zibē ušibi ana pāni-ka*, i. e., 'when the designs of the clubs and the edges(?) are brought to thee.' From other sources we know that the markings on the liver were drawn on a tablet and brought to the *bārū* or 'diviner' for interpretation. In order to account for the discrepancy between the name of the series and the fact that the first line of the first tablet does not, as is customary, begin with these words (cf. *CT*, XX, 1, 15) we must assume that the list of seventeen tablets indicated on K. 1352 (*CT*, XX, 1, 15-32) represents not the text itself, but the commentary to it drawn up for school purposes, or, as we might also put it, the "school edition" of the text, which, in accordance with the purpose served by it, does not follow the plan of the text and presumably does not furnish the whole of it. The existence of two distinct editions of the series is also shown by the other fragments belonging to the series. See the following note.

²⁷ KK. 3945 and 3951 (*CT*, XX, 43-48) forming Tablets 2 and 3 of the series. The colophon at the bottom of the of Pl. 48 states that this is the end of the third tablet of the series *multabiltum* and furnishes the opening line of the fourth tablet in agreement with *CT*, XX, 1, 18. The third tablet is therefore included and it is clear from a comparison of Pl. 45, 21 and 46, rev. 5 with *CT*, XX, 1, 17 that the school edition of the second tablet ends with Pl. 45, 20. According to Bezold (*Catalogue*, p. 579) K. 3951 is a duplicate of K. 3945 and K. 3986 belongs to K. 3945. Portions of the second and third tablets are also represented by KK. 10681, 10960, 11713, and 12315, and 82, 3-23, 5215 which together with K. 6297 have been "joined" to K. 3945 (Bezold, *loc. cit.*; Vol. IV, p. viii). K. 10805 (*CT*, XX, 50) appears to furnish the colophon also

the series covered a wide range, extending, indeed, to every part of the liver which had a significance in divination, and furnishing the interpretation for an almost endless number of variations observed in the character of the different parts and of their relation to one another, as well as of the markings and other signs noted on the liver surface.²⁸

Confining ourselves to the school edition of the first tablet of the series, mention should be made of an attempted translation of the text by Dr. Stephen H. Langdon²⁹ which, however, because of the author's failure to recognize the fundamental principle underlying divination through the sacrificial animal, namely, that the one organ on which the attention of the diviner was concentrated was the liver, was not successful. Since the correct interpretation and understanding of the text rest upon this thesis, Langdon's rendering is erroneous throughout and it is needless, therefore, to stop at every point and to indicate wherein the translation here given differs from that of Langdon. Credit is due to Langdon, however, for having correctly determined that Cols. I and II of the text are not synonymous.³⁰ He has also seen that the words in Col. I furnish what he calls the "salient feature" of the "condi-

for the third tablet of the series and would thus represent another copy. The tenth tablet is represented by K. 3983 published in *CT*, XX, 49, the opening line of which is to be completed according to *CT*, XX, 1, 25 and it is to be noted that K. 5151 (*CT*, XX, 7) also represents the beginning of this tablet. While both copies are unfortunately badly preserved, it seems quite clear that the two texts are not duplicates and the question again arises whether the one (K. 5151) may not represent a portion of the "official" edition and the other belong to the "school" edition. The thirteenth tablet is represented by 83, 1-18, 411 published *CT*, XX, 50, but the fact that the colophon and the opening line of the thirteenth tablet (*CT*, XX, 1, 28) appear *within* this text (obv. 7, 8) shows that here also two tablets (the twelfth and thirteenth) have been combined. That this text merely represents an extract from these two tablets may perhaps be concluded from the statement in connection with the colophon that fifty-three "signs" are noted. At all events an indication of this kind, taken together with the unusual circumstance of a colophon within a text and as a heading to what follows, may be regarded as satisfactory evidence that Ašurbanapal's scribes have, in this instance certainly, copied a school text and perhaps merely a school exercise based on the twelfth and thirteenth tablets of the *multa biltum* series. Portions of the seventh tablet of the series, finally, are represented by the unpublished fragment K. 6292, according to the indications in Bezold's *Catalogue*, p. 777, and by D.T. 49 (with the colophon of the eighth tablet) published by Boissier, *Documents*, pp. 248-50, and the same author's *Choix de Textes*, pp. 65-70 with attempted translation. Langdon (*JAOS*, XXVII, p. 88) apparently does not know of Boissier's two editions of this text.

²⁸For details and the general character of Babylonian hepatoscopy the reader is referred to the exposition of the subject in the writer's *Religion*, chap. xx, and to an article by the writer "The Liver in Babylonian Divination" to be published in Vol. XXVIII of *JAOS*.

²⁹"An Assyrian Grammatical Treatise on an Omen Tablet," *JAOS*, XXVII, pp. 88-103.

³⁰*Loc. cit.*, p. 88.

tional clause" in Col. III, and the words in Col. II the "salient feature" of the "result clause." The text, however, does not embody, as he supposes, a series of "rules" for the interpretation of omens nor does the third column furnish the "whole rule" from which the scribe, as Langdon supposes, has made an extract or an abbreviated copy. The purpose of the tablet is, as already intimated, to illustrate the principles and the method followed in the interpretation of omens derived from an inspection of the liver of the sacrificial animal. To this end, the text is divided into three parallel columns. The third column furnishes the sign noted on the liver and the interpretation given to it. In the first column the "catch-word" of the sign is entered, which forms the basis of the interpretation, while in the second, the "catch-word" or "catch-words" of the interpretation are added to *illustrate the connection between the sign and the meaning given to it*. The real difficulty in the text to be overcome is the determination of the terms introduced, which according to the thesis here maintained, all describe parts of the liver or phenomena to be observed on the liver. While some of the terms are still obscure, I believe that I am justified in thinking that most of them have been correctly determined by my investigations. The final test rests naturally in the ability to give a satisfactory meaning to both the signs observed and to the interpretation based on the signs.

In order to assist the reader in following the rendition of the text, a diagram of a sheep's liver is added to this article on which the chief parts are indicated by letters and elucidated by the addition (*a*) of the Latin names, and (*b*) of the equivalent terms used in the Babylonian omen texts (cf. p. 326). It is impossible in this article to enter into a discussion of *all* details and for our purposes it suffices to recall the general theory on which Babylonian hepatoscopy is based, namely, that the liver was regarded as the center of life and the seat of the soul, and that therefore, in the case of the sacrificial animal, the liver was the organ through which the will and intention of the gods as the givers and source of all life could be ascertained. The two deities more specifically associated with divination in general are Šamaš and Adad, who are known as *bêlê bîri*, "lords of inspection," and

who in the omen tablets in Ašurbanapal's library are invariably mentioned instead of Nebo and Tašmit of the other classes of the collection.³¹ The striking character of the organ in question, so much more complicated than, e. g., the heart and lungs, was no doubt a factor in the association of the liver with the seat of life. On opening an animal the liver is seen as the most prominent organ. To its peculiar appearance is added the fact that it is filled with blood—naturally associated even by primitive man with life.³² The phenomena that it presents through the gall-bladder terminating in a long duct (*ductus cysticus*) which again passes into a duct running across the liver (*ductus hepaticus*) that sends its branches into the various lobes of the liver (*lobus dexter*, *lobus sinister*, *lobus quadratus*, and *lobus caudatus*) are rendered still more striking by the large portal or hepatic vein (*vena portae*) which, like the hepatic duct, sends its offshoots, as subsidiary veins throughout the entire liver. To the layman, the markings of various kinds appearing as lines, indentures, and curves on the liver surface, due largely to the traces of the subsidiary hepatic and vein ducts, furnish another feature that arrests attention, and since no two livers are exactly alike in respect of these markings—as little as the marking on two leaves of a tree—it will be seen that a wide field over which fanciful imagination may roam at will is thus opened up. Lastly, there is besides the large vein (*vena cava* or *vena cava caudalis*), the transverse fissure or liver gate (*porta hepatis*) separating the upper lobe (*lobus caudatus*) from the three lower lobes. At one end of the pyramidal lobe is a finger-shaped appendix, known as the *processus pyramidalis* constantly varying in form, and presenting all manner of curious features. This lobe plays so significant a rôle in Greek and Roman hepatoscopy—based on the older Etruscan rites³³—that it was called by the Greeks ὁ λοβός, i. e., the lobe *par excellence*, and by the Romans *caput jecoris*, “head of the liver.”³⁴ At the

³¹ Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 226, n. 1.

³² About one-sixth of the blood of the animal is in the liver.

³³ See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 210 ff., and 320, n. 3, and Thulin, *Die etruskische Disziplin*, Vol. II (die Haruspicin), (Göteborg, 1906), pp. 3-10 and 50-54.

³⁴ Thulin, *loc. cit.*, p. 30 ff. The Septuagint correctly renders the Hebrew expression יִתְרַת עַל הַכֶּבֶד (Ex. 29:13; Lev. 3:4; 8:16, etc.) for the *lobus pyramidalis* by ὁ λοβός; see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 231, and the reference there to Moore's important article in the Nöldeke *Festschrift*, pp. 761 ff.

other end of the pyramidal lobe, there is a second appendix known as the *processus papillaris*, which varying in size and at times extremely small, also plays a part in hepatoscopy though a much less prominent one than the *processus pyramidalis*.³⁵

To all these parts and phenomena of the liver the attention of the bârû priests was directed; and by the application chiefly of two principles, one based on the association of ideas, the other on the association of words, an elaborate and complicated system of interpretation was developed, the influence of which may be gauged when it is considered that the system furnished a guide to the rulers and individuals of Babylonia and Assyria from before the days of Sargon (*ca.* 3000 B. C.) to the days of Nabonidus—the last king of the neo-Babylonian empire (555–539 B. C.).³⁶ No expedition was undertaken, no battle was risked, no building begun and no important official act entered upon without calling in the aid of the bârû priests to examine the sacrificial animal—generally a sheep and frequently more than one—and on the basis of a report on the condition of the liver to render a decision that was regarded as indicative of the divine will or intent.

The task thus cut out both for the full-fledged priest on whom the obligation rested to interpret the omens derived from the inspection of the liver, as well as for those who were being trained for the service, was clearly defined. The position and character of all the various parts of the liver had to be carefully noted, all peculiarities recorded and the form of the markings, their number, and outlines closely observed. It would appear that all these phenomena were written down on memoranda tablets; and in an actual record of a liver inspection from the days of Nabonidus, taken on an occasion when the king wished to restore the statue of Sin and other gods to the rebuilt temple of the moon-god at Harran, no less than seventeen signs are set down and the meaning of each defined.³⁷ It was for the purpose of securing a correct interpretation of the signs observed that the collections of omens,

³⁵ For further details regarding the anatomy of the liver, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 220, 221.

³⁶ For examples of omen-texts from the days of Sargon to Nabonidus see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 224–320.

³⁷ Messerschmidt, *Inscript der Stele Nabu'naiids* (Berlin, 1896), Col. XI. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 266–71.

based no doubt in part on past experience and in part on the application of the principles developed by the priests in the unfolding of their system, were made, and which, deposited in the temple archives or more probably in the schools attached to the temples could be consulted as guides and reference works. The occasions on which recourse was had to divination through the liver being primarily of an official and public character, the interpretations generally bear on affairs of state and on public events—war, conquest, crops, the army, the rulers, and the royal household. It is only occasionally that matters of concern to the ordinary individual are introduced. It was, however, a comparatively simple matter to extend the application to more personal affairs. The main object was to determine whether a particular sign was favorable or unfavorable. If the former, the interpretation was not limited to the particular case set down, but could be applied to any other situation that arose.³⁸ Hence in the omens introduced into the inscriptions of Nabonidus as well as in the earlier documents and in official reports of various periods, the interpretations attached to the omens, copied evidently from some collection serving as a guide, do not necessarily bear upon the question to be answered through the liver inspection.³⁹ The interpretation is added, primarily, as an indication whether the sign is favorable or unfavorable. In other words, the interpretation serves merely as an example illustrative of the favorable or unfavorable character of the sign in question. With this determined, the answer to the inquiry depended either upon the summary of all the signs noted or upon the application of the illustrative interpretation of the specific case under consideration. These same collections of omens with the interpretations also served as the basis of instruction in the temple schools, but in addition, as already suggested, special school editions of the collections in whole or in part were prepared, adapted for illustrating the method to be followed in the system of interpretation and containing all manner of explanations to facilitate the task of instructing the pupils in the science of hepatoscopy.

³⁸ Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 246, 247 for details and illustrations.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 258.

Our text furnishes a particularly valuable example of the pedagogical plan adopted, and, both for this reason and because of its intrinsic value, justifies detailed treatment. As already pointed out, it consists of three columns on each side, the third containing the omen noted with the interpretation, while the first and second are added in order to illustrate the connection between the sign and the interpretation. The proper method of treating the text is, therefore, first to set down the entry in the third column, and then to take up the remaining two.

The first line of the third column reads:

šumma NA⁴⁰ erik⁴¹-ma niptû⁴² [ikru]⁴³ rubû ina ħarrâni illiku⁴⁴ ikašad.⁴⁵

"If the biliary duct is long and the hepatic duct is short, the ruler in the expedition which he undertakes will conquer."

To this omen the first and second columns read:

a-rik-tum
"length"

ka-šit-tum
"conquest"

which means that the 'length' of the biliary duct forms the basis for the interpretation of the sign as 'conquest.' No special reference is made to the 'shortness' of the hepatic duct, the favorable character of this sign being either assumed as known or regarded as of secondary consideration. From other sources we know that a long cystic duct was a favorable sign, e. g., V R. 63, II, 10 and 23, where it is interpreted as pointing to the 'long life' of the ruler.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ For NA=biliary duct (*ductus cysticus*), see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 234, n. 13. The phonetic reading is unknown.

⁴¹ Written GID-DA. Cf. Brünnow, Nos. 7511 and 7562.

⁴² GİR to be read niptû, —the sign for the hepatic duct (*ductus hepaticus*). See Jastrow, *ibid.* and p. 242, n. 1.

⁴³ Read GUD-DA to be interpreted as ikru, for which compare CT, XX, 1, 23 where GID-DA and GUDDA occur in contrast, while the phonetic reading ik-ru for the latter is shown by CT, XX, 31, 13, 14 where GIDDA and ik-ru are contrasted. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 253, n. 6, and Langdon, *JAOS*, XXVIII, p. 147, n. 2.

⁴⁴ Written DU with the phonetic complement ku.

⁴⁵ KUR(ad) to be read therefore ikašad. Cf. Brünnow, No. 7393.

⁴⁶ Other examples, Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 252, n. 3.

The second line reads:

šumma irru saḥirūti⁴⁷ al-ku-[u]^{47a} kašittum.⁴⁸

"If the 'network' is continuous—conquest."

To this omen—briefly expressed—the first and second columns read:

a-lik-tum
"course"

ka-šit-tum
"conquest"

i. e., the 'continuous' course of the network of markings on the liver is the basis of the interpretation as 'conquest.' The term translated 'network' refers to the grouping of markings more specifically on the left lobe of the liver, where the traces of the subsidiary hepatic and vein ducts produce a varying number of little curves and lines, forming all manner of patterns.⁴⁹ The peculiar nature of the sign here noted seems to be that the markings either form a continuous series, suggestive, therefore, of an unbroken course of victory, or that they all run in one direction, pointing to the continuous onward march of the king's army. The third line, presenting both in the sign noted and in the interpretation a more complicated character, reads:

šumma martu⁵⁰ ištu imitti ana šumēli dakšat⁵¹-ma di-ki-[is]-sa⁵² uššur⁵³ bēl limutti⁵⁴-ka ša idku⁵⁵ ḫāt-ka ikašad.⁵⁶

"If the gall-bladder is pierced from the right to left and its 'split' is loose, thy hand will overcome thy enemy who advances (against thee)."

⁴⁷ ŠA-NIGIN. For the reading and interpretation see Jastrow, II, p. 256, n. 4.

^{47a} Cf. la al-kam 'not continuous,' i. e., broken up and divided (Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete*, No. 107, rev. 16), and šalḫu 'torn,' i. e., 'broken up' (Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 293, n. 5), the contrast to alku.

⁴⁸ KUR(tum)=kašittum. For many examples of omens thus briefly indicated see Jastrow, *loc. cit.*, pp. 258, 259.

⁴⁹ See Boissier, *Choix de Textes relatifs à la Divination*, pp. 89 and 93 and CT, XX, 46, 54-56; 48, 30, etc., where the network is put down as consisting of from six to seventeen distinct bits.

⁵⁰ ŠIR=martu 'gall-bladder.' Cf. Brünnow, No. 4196 and Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 229, n. 3.

⁵¹ The phonetic reading for IT-KU (šat) is furnished by the parallel line K. 134, 1 (Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 78). See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 336, n. 11 for a fuller discussion of the term and of other passages in which it occurs.

⁵² Di-ki-sa in text, but probably an error for di-ki-is-sa as throughout K. 134. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 336, n. 1.

⁵³ BAR (ur)=uššur (Brünnow, No. 1814). For the meaning 'loose' or 'detached' cf. Haupt, *ASKT*, 85, 40 where uššuru is used of a woman whose womb has prolapsed, i. e., become detached. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 305, n. 6. Note the synonyms in the lexicographical list II R. 39, No. 1, obv. 4-5 pū pitū "open mouth" and pū uššuru 'loosened mouth' for both of which phrases the signs are KA-BAR(EA).

⁵⁴ Cf. Brünnow, No. 10958.

⁵⁵ ZI(ku)=idku (Brünnow, No. 2308) (with overlapping vowel) from dikū—the common verb to indicate the advance of an army. See Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrian Dictionary*, pp. 245b f.

⁵⁶ KUR(ad)=ikašad as in the first line.

Cols. I and II read:

uš-šur-tum
"looseness"

ka-šit-tum
"conquest"

i. e., the fact that the pierced gall-bladder is detached or 'loose' points in this case again to 'conquest.' The 'split' runs to the left, and the 'looseness' is therefore a bad sign for the enemy's host.⁵⁷

L. 4 reads:

šumma ina kap-pi⁵⁸ kabitti⁵⁹ ša imitti padanu⁶⁰ ina kap-pi kabitti ša šumēli nap̄tartu⁶¹ šu-šur⁶² pā⁶³ nipti ina eli šibi⁶⁴(?) illik, nakru-ka itti ili⁶⁵ ka-mi u suḥ-ḥur.

⁵⁷ See above p. 291.

⁵⁸ We have here in the word kappu 'wing' the very appropriate term for a liver 'lobe,' and it is interesting to note that the right and left lobe (*lobus dexter*, *lobus sinister*) were distinguished precisely as in modern anatomical nomenclature. A special designation is also found for the *lobus caudatus* namely UR-MURUB = kabittu ḳablitu (or perhaps ḳabal kabitti) 'the middle liver'—which is likewise appropriate since the *lobus caudatus* lies approximately in the middle of the liver; see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 231. Whether the right lobe was still further divided into two sections, as in modern nomenclature, by the groove in which the gall-bladder rests into (a) *lobus quadratus* to the left and (b) *lobus dexter* to the right I have not yet been able to determine, though the groove itself was distinguished. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 325, n. 5.

⁵⁹ For UR (= kabittu), the most common sign of the liver, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 213, n. 2; for other names and signs, see the writer's article, "Signs and Names of the Liver in Babylonia" (*ZA*, XX, pp. 105-29). It is possible that in omen texts ḥašū as in the omen report (Jastrow, II, p. 276, n. 7) was the designation of the liver and not kabittu.

⁶⁰ GIR = padanu (Brünnow, No. 9191) 'road,' the designation of a certain kind of markings on the liver. The term padanu (see the phonetic writing pa-da-na-am, *CT*, IV, 34, obv. 2) indicates that it had the form of a continuous line; see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 237 (note) and p. 275, n. 2.

⁶¹ GAB, the common meaning of which is paṭāru 'open' (Brünnow, No. 4488), and which is of very frequent occurrence in omen texts as a verb, e. g., GAB (at) = paṭrat (*CT*, XX, 1, 6, and 14, 6, or without a phonetic complement, ll. 8, 27 of Pl. 1; Pl. 7 (K, 5151), 4-11; 15, 2-39; 26 rev. and 28 rev., with plural sign, Pl. 14, 13, but also as a noun, Pl. 48, 19. In our passage the noun is evidently intended, hence the suggested reading. Under 'splits' the fissures frequently to be observed on the surface of the liver or on such parts as the gall-bladder, the cystic duct, and the hepatic duct, etc., are meant. In the Sargon omens (IV R. 34, No. 1) as many as seven such fissures in the gall-bladder are instanced; cf. Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 238. The phonetic reading šu-šur suggests that the combination GAB-UŠ, which is also of frequent occurrence, e. g., *CT*, XX, 1, 17, with the phonetic complement tum (also Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, pp. 57, 59) and with the plural sign (*CT*, XX, 45, 21) is to be explained as GAB = 'split' and UŠ (Brünnow, No. 5033) = 'straight' while the phonetic ending tum suggests the reading nap̄tartum. GAB-UŠ would therefore be a fuller form for the noun to indicate, as in our text, 'a straight fissure;' see further, Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 337, n. 9.

⁶² III, I, from ašāru 'to be straight;' cf. šu-šur in the interpretation of an omen in an inscription of Nabonidus (Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 253, n. 2).

⁶³ Written KA. The 'mouth' of the hepatic duct is the one end of this part.

⁶⁴ Tū appears to be one of the designations for the 'edge of the liver.' For the reading šibi offered tentatively see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 240 (note), and p. 325, n. 5. I take it that the sign is intended to represent the case in which the hepatic duct is unusually long so that it appears to fall over the liver edge.

⁶⁵ For itti ili in the sense of 'with the help of a god' see V R. 63, II, 11 (Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 253).

"If on the right lobe of the liver there is a 'road,' on the left lobe a straight fissure (and) the mouth of the hepatic extends over the edge(?), thy enemy with the help of a god will be captured and surrounded."

To this omen, the adjoining two columns read:

šu-šur-tum	sa-kap nakri
"straightness"	"overthrow of the enemy"

i. e., the 'straightness' of the fissure and of the 'road' (the straightness of which is implied in the term used) forms the basis for the interpretation that the ruler will proceed directly against the enemy and subjugate him. The secondary sign of the extent of the hepatic duct is not specifically referred to, its favorable character, being again assumed as known or not calling for any special comment.

L. 5:

šumma KAK-TI⁶⁶ ša imitti ištēnit⁶⁷ at-rat ummāni šum damiḫti⁶⁸ ileḫi.⁶⁹

"If of the KAK-TI, the one to the right is abnormal, my army will acquire a good name."

To this sign, the two columns read:

a-tar-tum	za-kar šu-mu ⁷⁰
"excessive"	"fame"

i. e., the abnormally large character of the KAK-TI suggests by a natural association of ideas great renown.

L. 6:

šumma rēš NA zu-ḫur⁷¹ MU-SAG⁷² rubi⁷³ ummāni šum damiḫti ileḫi.

"If the top of the biliary duct is elevated, supremacy of the ruler, my army will acquire renown."

⁶⁶ Perhaps to be read sikkatu 'plug'—a term of frequent occurrence (e. g., Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 103; *CT*, XX, 14, 17, etc.), the meaning of which I have not been able as yet to determine. For a further discussion, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 293, n. 7.

⁶⁷ GIŠ (it) = ištēnit, though from the list V R. 12, No. 3, 32 it might appear that the combination can also stand for the masculine. In our case the feminine of the following verb speaks in favor of the feminine noun.

⁶⁸ ŠAL-SIG (Brünnow, No. 10955)—the contrast to ŠAL-HUL (l. 3). For the reading and other passages see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 336, n. 11.

⁶⁹ Tr (ḫi) = ileḫi (Brünnow, No. 1700).

⁷⁰ Cf. the proper name EN-lil-za-kar-šu-mi (V R. 44, III, 41).

⁷¹ Variant: zuḫ-ḫur II, 1, from zaḫāru 'to be high.' See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 327, n. 9.

⁷² MU-SAG, i. e., MU = niš (*CT*, XII, 8, 8a) and SAG = rēš u, literally therefore, 'raising of head,' for which see Hunger, *Becherwahrnehmung*, Text A, 69. A parallel expression is discussed, Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 355, n. 12.

⁷³ NUN = rub ū.

Cols. I and II read:

zuḳ-ḳur-tum
"elevation"

za-kaṛ šu-mu
"renown"

The 'elevated' biliary duct points to the heightening of the fame of the ruler and of his army. Note the play between zuḳḳur and zakar šumi.

L. 7:

šummu elānu⁷⁴ dannī⁷⁵ šīru kima sikkati⁷⁶ izziz⁷⁷ zibu^{77a} šarri kēnu⁷⁸ ummān šarri māḥira⁷⁹ la ibaši.⁸⁰

"If above the portal vein, the flesh stands out like a plug, the king's 'club' (or weapon) will endure, the army of the king will be without a rival."

The first two columns read:

sik-ka-tum
"plug"

li-ḳi-e li-ti
"acquiring glory"

i. e., the fact that the flesh at the point indicated stands out like a plug, barring, as it were, the progress of the enemy, is the basis for the interpretation that the arms and army of the king will stand firm against all attacks.

L. 8:

šumma šapal⁸¹ marti ka-bar māru⁸² eli abi-šu ikabit.⁸³

"If the base of the gall-bladder is swollen, the son will be mightier than his father."

⁷⁴ Similarly we read, CT, XX, 37, 9, 'if the liver gate above the hepatic duct (ana elāni nip ti) is depressed,' etc.

⁷⁵ DAN probably to be read dannu 'strong' and the designation for the *vena portae* or great vein of the liver lying at the side of the hepatic duct. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 240, n. 2.

⁷⁶ (Giš) KAK = sikkatu (Brünnnow, No. 5267) — a reading that is confirmed by the word sik-ka-tum in the first column.

⁷⁷ GUB (iz) = izziz; cf. Brünnnow, No. 4893.

^{77a} For the reading zibu of the sign (giš) KU in the omen texts instead of kakku and the meaning 'club' assigned to zibu see below, p. 312, n. 161.

⁷⁸ GI-NA.

⁷⁹ GAB(ri) = māḥiru (Brünnnow, No. 4502), or to be read phonetically gab-ri.

⁸⁰ TUK (ši) = ibaši (cf. Brünnnow, No. 11237).

⁸¹ SIG (Brünnnow, No. 11873) contrasted in 79, 7-8, 129, ll. 4-5 (Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 43) to SAG = ḳaḳḳadu 'head' of the gall-bladder. It is therefore a synonym of the usual suḥ = išdu (Brünnnow, No. 4811) used in the omen texts for the 'base,' or what we should call the upper portion of any of the parts of the liver, only that as ll. 1-3 of the text just quoted show, it represents the extreme end of the gall-bladder, whereas suḥ can be used with the plural sign in the general sense of 'lower parts.' Although I have adopted the reading šaplu it is possible that the sign is to be read išdu just like suḥ.

⁸² TUR-NITAH.

⁸³ DUGUD (it) = ikabit (Brünnnow, No. 9228). Cf. CT, XX, 31, 19-20 i-ka-b-bu-ut.

To which line the adjoining columns read:

ka-bar-tum
"swelling"

e-mu-ku
"power"

i. e., the 'swelling' of the lower part of the gall-bladder points to 'power,' while the fact that the swelling is 'below' indicates that the one who is 'lower'—therefore a son in contrast to a father—will be the mightier. The parts of the liver are always reckoned from below. Thus of the three divisions into which any part is divided (see Jastrow, II, p. 254, n. 3) the 'head' is the lowest and the 'base' is at what we would call the upper end. The gall-bladder is generally thicker at the 'head' and grows thinner as we reach the 'base' or 'lower' part. If, therefore, a liver shows the reverse order, it is an indication that the natural order will be reversed—the son will be stronger than his father.

L. 9:

šumma kirbannu⁸⁴ imitti pû-šu ki-ma kur-sin-ni⁸⁵ rapîš⁸⁶
zibu šarri kēnu ummān šarri i-dan-nin-ma māḥira la ibaši.

"If the mouth of the inner surface to the right is broad like an ankle-bone, the 'club' (or weapon) of the king will be firm, the king's host will be strong and without a rival."

To this sign Cols. I and II read:

ra-pa-aš-tum
"breadth"

me-til-lu-tum⁸⁷
"sovereignty"

The association of ideas between 'breadth' and 'extension' of rulership is obvious. The double interpretation—not infrequent in omen texts⁸⁸—represents an alternative as in ll. 6–7, so that the sign in question may be interpreted with reference to the ruler or to his army according to the occasion of the inquiry.

⁸⁴ LAG = kirbannu (Brünnow, No. 5951). This reading is suggested by the phonetic reading ki-ri-ba-an-na 'the inner part' (CT, XX, 15, 27 and Pl. 48, 17). Another LAG with the plural sign added occurs in connection with the hepatic duct (CT, XX, 45, 26), the portal vein (l. 31), the gall-bladder (l. 36) and the 'net-work' (Pl. 46, 57) and is to be read minātu (Brünnow, No. 5973). The part in question is larger (rabi) than 'its interior surface.' See Jastrow, II, p. 298, n. 12 for a full discussion of both terms.

⁸⁵ Cf. CT, XX, 25, 18; 27, 5; 29, 6.

⁸⁶ DAMAL (iṣ) = irapîš (Brünnow, No. 545). See Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 223, 22–27, etc.

⁸⁷ See Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrian Dictionary*, p. 623.

⁸⁸ See examples in Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 253, n. 4.

L. 10:

šumma maš⁸⁹ ma-la ubâni im-ta-ši⁹⁰ ardu ma-la bêli-šu
i-ma-aš-ši u-lu amtu bêli-ša i-ram-ši-ma ma-la bêlti-ša
i-ma-aš-ši.

"If the papillary appendix in comparison with the pyramidal appendix is large, the servant in comparison with his master will be large, or in the case of a maid, her master will love her, and in comparison with her mistress she will be large."

The first two columns read:

ra-bu-u
"large"

ma-šu-u
"broad"⁹¹

The papillary appendix figured on the picture of a liver, CT, VI, 1, it will be observed, is quite small in comparison with the finger-shaped pyramidal appendix. At times, indeed, the form is so tiny as to be scarcely visible, and not infrequently on sheep's livers that I have seen it appeared to be entirely wanting. The circumstance of its being 'large' is therefore unusual, and it is consequently taken as a sign that the one who is small will become great. The contrast between the 'servant' and the 'master,' or the maid and her mistress represents the contrast between

⁸⁹The sign MAŠ (Brünnow, No. 2024) designates the *processus papillaris*—the smaller appendix attached to the caudate lobe. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 255, n. 4, where the reading BIR (corrected p. 267, n. 3) is an error for MAŠ (see Streck, *Oriental. Literaturzeit.*, Vol. X, Sp. 72). Niru which at one time I took to be the phonetic reading turns out to be the reading for ME-NI 'the common bile duct' (*ductus choledochus*). See Jastrow, II, p. 326, n. 5.

⁹⁰For mašû in the sense of 'large,' 'broad,' 'compressed,' and the like (Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 570b) not to be confused with another mašû (or a mašû [?]) (Muss-Arnolt, pp. 59 and 570) which on the contrary means 'narrow,' 'small,' etc.

⁹¹The juxtaposition of rabû with mašû is at first sight somewhat puzzling because of the apparently double meaning attached to mašû as either 'small' or 'large' (see preceding note). That a contrast is intended between the appearance of the usually very small *processus papillaris* and the ordinarily much larger *processus pyramidalis* is of course obvious, the former being represented as more fully developed than usual in comparison with the latter; and since the verb mašû is used to express this idea, it follows that this verb must also be intended in the second column, and not mašû 'small.' The two terms rabû and mašû are therefore meant to explain this condition, prognosticating the 'fulness' of the servant and maid as against the master and mistress. The word rabû in the first column is introduced as a synonym of mašû in order to show the justification of interpreting the omen as pointing to breadth or enlargement. The pupil is in this way taught that the fact that the ordinarily small papillary appendix is 'large' is the basis for the interpretation that servant and maid—instead of the master and mistress—are to be 'large,' or in other words the topsy-turvy character of the two appendices points to a reversion of the natural order—the small will be large and the large will become small. For the preposition mala or mal used to express a comparison see Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 510b.

the two appendices, and the unusual condition of the larger appendix being compressed is looked upon as a confirmation of the interpretation that the inferior shall assert himself (or herself) against the superior.

L. 12:

šumma šumêli marti ša-mid šêpu-ka sa-ad nakri.⁹²

"If the left side of the gall-bladder is firm, through thee, destruction of the enemy."

The two explanatory columns read:

ša-mit-tum
"firmness"

išdân⁹³ kinâti⁹⁴
"secure bases"

i. e., the 'firmness' of the left side of the gall-bladder points to 'security' and the fact that it is the left side of the gall-bladder which is 'firm' is a bad omen for the enemy, who is always represented by the left side in contrast to the ruler or to the ruler's army, symbolized by the right side as the lucky or favored side.

L. 13:

šumma kabittu imittu ub-bu-uk⁹⁵ išd-a-an kinâti.⁹⁶

"If the liver to the right is secure—secure bases."

⁹² A complete parallel to this line is found in one of the omens attached to an inscription of Nabonidus (V R. 63, II, 28) which may be taken as a proof that the interpretations of the omens in a report such as the priests of the king furnished, are taken from collections like ours, compiled as reference works and as guides. See for the line Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 261, n. 5. On sa-ad from sâdu 'destroy' see Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 747a.

⁹³ Written suḡ = iš-du (Brünnow, No. 4811) with the complement a-an to indicate the plural or possibly the dual (see Ungnad, *Assyr. Gram.*, § 22) and Lajciak, *Plural- und Dualendungen an semitische Nomen* [Leipzig, 1903], pp. 48-55). The use of iš-du 'support,' 'foundation' is introduced in view of šêpu 'foot' in the interpretation, and if išdân be taken as a dual, the reference would be to the legs as 'supports,' just as in the Targum to I Kings 10:19 the same word אֲשֵׁרֶת 'supports' is the rendering for יָרֵךְ.

⁹⁴ GI-NA with the plural sign.

⁹⁵ II, 1 from abâku which is another Assyrian verb that like maṣû (see above, p. 298, n. 90) has two meanings the one contrary to the other (1) 'endure,' 'cling to,' etc. (cf. Arabic عَیِفَ) and (2) 'throw off,' 'overthrow,' etc. The context—by the association with išdân

kinâti—shows clearly that the former sense is here meant, whereas in other passages it is found in the sense of 'remove, misplaced': ub-bu-kat (CT, XX, 32, 77, 78) šu-ta-bak-ka (Olay, *Cassite Archives*, XIV, No. 4, 6, etc.). See Jastrow, II, p. 280, n. 8. Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 1774 (81, 2-4, 227) šumma kabittu imittu e-bi-ik furnishes a parallel to our passage. Delitzsch (*HWB*, p. 115a) is hardly justified in assuming a stem אָפַק, but at the most אָפַךְ by the side of אָבַךְ—though the two are probably identical as Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 6a, regards them.

⁹⁶ Written as in the second column of the preceding line.

The first two columns read:

e-pi-ik-tum
"security"

išd-a-an kināti
"secure bases"

The association of ideas is obvious and the circumstance that it is the right side of the liver which exhibits compactness adds to the favorable character of the sign.

L. 14:

šumma MAŠ [e-]ba-at⁹⁷ ebûr mâti išir.⁹⁸

"If the papillary appendix is inclosed, the produce of the land will thrive."

The explanatory columns read:

e-bi-tum
"inclosure"

šubtu⁹⁹ ne-eḥ-tum
"peaceful dwelling"

The interpretation of good crops as 'security' is an interesting association of ideas. In times of disturbance, the even course of things is interfered with and vice-versa, bad crops lead to internal disorders.

L. 15 reads:

šumma martu pânātu-ša¹⁰⁰ ana imitti šaknû ta-a-a-rat ili
ana amêli šarru mât-su i-ram-ma.

"If the edges of the gall-bladder lie toward the right, reconciliation of god with man, the king will be gracious to his land."¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ The restoration is indicated by the word in the first column. The underlying stem is the same from which we obtain uppu 'inclosure' (see Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 78b) and the same verb (II, 1) is found as ub-bu-u IV R. 26, No. 2, 4 i-mat zu-ka-ki-pu a-me-lam la ub-bu-u 'the spittle of a scorpion does not inclose a man;' cf. Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 13b, and also see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 305, n. 7.

⁹⁸ SI-DI(ir) = išir from išâru (Brünnow, No. 3461). The phrase occurs frequently in astrological omens, e. g., Craig, *Astrological-Astronomical Texts*, p. 57, obv. 4; 60 (K. 3002), 11-16; 10 (la išir); 68, obv. 9, etc., etc.

⁹⁹ KI-KU = šubtu (Brünnow, No. 9824). The phrase is of frequent occurrence in historical texts (see the passages in Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, pp. 662b ff.) as well as in omen texts, e. g., CT, XX, 4 (K. 6689), 11; 34, 6 šubtu ne-eḥ-ti išab, etc. Cf. Jastrow, II, p. 260, n. 7.

¹⁰⁰ IGI(MEŠ)—the points or edges of the gall-bladder, perhaps to be read amerûti See below, p. 301, n. 101a.

¹⁰¹ Literally 'will love.' The two interpretations are to be regarded as alternatives according to prevailing conditions or to the nature of the inquiry.

Unfortunately the first column to this line is injured.^{101a} The second column reads:

ta-a-a-ra-tum "reconciliation"

We are therefore left in doubt as to the exact feature of the sign noted which suggests the return of god to man, and the love of the king for his land, which is likewise viewed as a reconciliation on his part. A fuller form of such an interpretation is found in the omens attached to a text of Nabonidus.¹⁰² A parallel to the sign noted is found in this inscription (Col. XI, 23) where it is interpreted as piḫittu 'appointment,' i. e., pointing to a favorable answer to the inquiry whether such and such a one is to be intrusted with some official service.¹⁰³

L. 16:

šumma 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 na ka-bi-is ummāni-ka ina reš êḫli-šu namra¹⁰⁴ ikkal.¹⁰⁵

"If the head of the biliary duct is depressed, thy army will, out of the best of his (sc. the enemy's) land, acquire glory."

The two explanatory columns read:

[ki-ib]su¹⁰⁶
"depression"

a-kal nam-ra¹⁰⁷
"acquiring glory"

^{101a} Perhaps to be restored a[me-ru-ti] in the sense of 'edges,' corresponding to IGI(MEŠ) in Col. III (Brünnow, Nos. 9267 and 9325). See Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 10a and IV R.2 I*, Col. III, 1-2. IGI-GAB-A(MEŠ)=a-me-ru-ti.

¹⁰² *Inscription der Stele Nabu'naiids* (ed. Messerschmidt), Col. XI, 14-21. "Those who hated will love (ir-ta-a-mu same verb as in our passage). In a land of hostility there will be reconciliation (su-lum-ma-a), Sin, and Šamaš will walk at my army's side and overthrow the enemy, the angered gods will be at peace (šalmu) with man." Cf. Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 268.

¹⁰³ On the custom of consulting omens through a liver inspection in the case of appointments to office, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 268, n. 10 and the references there given.

¹⁰⁴ 𐎶𐎶-LA=zittu or namru. See Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts" (*AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 100 ff.) where this passage and parallels are fully treated.

¹⁰⁵ Kū=a kálu (Brünnow, No. 882). On akálu as a synonym of kašādu and the phrase here used see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 254, n. 8, as well as the article quoted in the preceding note.

¹⁰⁶ The correct restoration suggested by Hunger, *Becherwahrnehmung bei den Babyloniern*, p. 37.

¹⁰⁷ Two words suggest the reading namru for 𐎶𐎶-LA in the third column and ikkal for kū. Instead of namra, however, zittam as a synonym is possible. See for the interpretation of this line with a full discussion of numerous parallel passages, Jastrow "Notes on Omen Texts," *AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 97-103.

The fact that the biliary duct is deeply set points to the firm footing that the king's army will secure in the enemy's territory.

L. 17:

šumma na kima azkari¹⁰⁸ ana šaplānu¹⁰⁹ mât nakri šal-ta¹¹⁰ ilami.¹¹¹

"If the biliary duct is like a crescent at the lower end, the enemy's land will be surrounded with hostility."

The two explanatory columns read:

šap-liš ka-na-šu¹¹²
"bent below"

kašitti¹¹³ kâtâ
"conquest"

i. e., the circumstance that the 'lower' part of the biliary duct is curved so as to resemble a crescent, points to the 'humiliation' of the enemy's land or, in other words, to its conquest. It will be observed that the sign involves a twofold association of ideas—the 'curving' and the fact that the curving is 'below'—both suggesting a lowering and a bending to superior power.

L. 18:

šumma mu reš kabitti¹¹⁴ ša imitti ul-lu-uš¹¹⁵ ul-lu-uš lib-bi ummâni.¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁸ UD-SAKAR=azkaru 'new-moon' and then the crescent of the moon as so frequently depicted on seal cylinders (Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 26a). The biliary duct appears as crescent-shaped, e. g., on the clay model of a liver (CT, VI, 1).

¹⁰⁹ KI-TA(nu)=šaplānu (Brünnow, No. 9673)—the contrast to elānu in l. 7. The direction of the parts of the liver being, as already indicated (see above p. 297), from below upward or from right to left, the 'lower end' of the biliary duct refers to what we would call the 'upper' or 'left' end.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 226, 11; CT, XX, 12 (K. 9213), 7, etc.

¹¹¹ NI-GIN(mi)=ilami (cf. Brünnow, No. 10334).

¹¹² The contrast e-liš ka-na-šu with the explanation u-šur-tum 'defeat' is found in the lexicographical list Rm. 131, 7 (Meissner, *Supplement Texts*, p. 20), which appears to be likewise devoted to an explanation of terms occurring in divination texts, arranged on the same principle as ours. See below p. 310, n. 147.

¹¹³ KUR(ti)=kašitti.

¹¹⁴ MU-SAG-UR frequently used in association with U-SAG-UR, e. g., CT, XX, 1, obv. 4-5, Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 38, col. I, rev. 14, etc. Inasmuch as in Roman hepatoscopy the 'head of the liver' *caput jecoris* (see above p. 289) is the designation of the *processus pyramidalis*, I am inclined to take SAG-UR=reš kabitti 'head of the Liver' as the point of this appendix. Therefore MU-SAG-UR=the 'upper' surface of the point and U-SAG-UR the 'under' surface. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 229, n. 1. U-SAG-UR is to be read kubšu (Brünnow, No. 5864), the reading of MU-SAG is still unknown. The element UR is often omitted in the case of both of these designations, e. g., CT, XX, 14, 12; 15, 28, etc.

¹¹⁵ II, 1 of alāšu, the context suggests 'enlarge' as the fundamental meaning of alāšu.

¹¹⁶ For other examples of this phrase, see CT, XX, 31, 13, 14; Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 8, rev. 12 and 14, etc., and in the complete parallel to our line in the *Inscription der Stele Nabu'nuids* (Messerschmidt), Col. XI, 38. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 271.

"If the upper part of the liver to the right is enlarged, rejoicing of heart of my army."

To this line, the adjoining two columns read:

ul-šu
"enlargement"

ul-šu-um-ma
"rejoicing"

Here we have, as in the following line, the direct play upon words as the basis for the association of ideas, the 'enlargment' of the point of the *processus pyramidalis* suggesting the 'enlargement' of the spirits of the army.

L. 19:

šumma gi-biš imitti marti uktabir¹¹⁷ gi-biš ummāni ana māt nakri.

"If the bag of the gall-bladder to the right is swollen, (advance of) my forces to the enemy's country."

The two explanatory columns read:

gi-ib-šu
"swelling"

gi-ib-šum-ma
"amassing"

As in the previous line, the word to the right indicates the verbal noun, and to the left the substantive form proper—distinguished by the emphatic ending *m*.

L. 20:

šumma ina imitti marti zibu¹¹⁸ šakin¹¹⁹-ma šapliš immar¹²⁰ zibu ma-ag-ša-ru zibu Šamaš.¹²¹

"If to the right of the gall-bladder there is a 'club' seen below, the club (or weapon) will be powerful—it is the club of Šamaš."¹²¹

¹¹⁷ *Ḫu-si*=uktabir. See Jastrow, II, p. 269, n. 3.

¹¹⁸ (*Grš*) *ku* to be read as above p. 296, n. 77^a, pointed out to be *zi-bu*, when used to designate some phenomenon on the liver, is of very frequent—indeed constant—occurrence in divination texts. It is the name given to certain markings on the liver that were fantastically viewed as 'weapons' and associated with the weapons of various gods, according to their varying forms. These markings are particularly prominent in the case of livers of sheep raised in marshy districts and are in part at least pathological in character. See Thulin, *Die etruskische Disciplin*, Vol. II, pp. 38, 39. For a full discussion of these markings see Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts" (II. "The Weapon of the Gods"), *AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 103-5.

¹¹⁹ *GAR* to be read *šakin*, the phonetic complement in being frequently added, e.g., *CT*, XX, 31, 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, etc., or for the plural *nu* as above, p. 300, l. 15.

¹²⁰ *IGI* to be read *im-mar* as passages with the phonetic complement *mar* added show, e.g., *CT*, XX, 32, 77; Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, pp. 52, 17; 69, 12.

¹²¹ An explanatory note added to specify the particular kind of marking meant. See Jastrow, *AJSL*, XXIII, 113.

The two explanatory columns read:

mag-ša-ru
"power"

da-na-nu
"strong"

The underlying stem *gašāru* signifying 'to be strong,' the meaning of the noun form cannot be doubtful; its explanation as *dananu* 'strong' is a further aid to the determination of its meaning. In this case, there is a deviation from the principles to be observed in the relationship of the two explanatory columns to each other, inasmuch as *dananu* does not actually occur in the interpretation, but is added as an explanation of *magšaru*. For this reason, as well as because of other considerations set forth elsewhere, I take *magšaru* as the actual designation of the club (or weapon) of the sun-god with which the particular form of 'club' observed is compared. The interpretation, concisely put, is intended to suggest that since the 'club' is a *magšaru*, the sign points to the 'strength' of the weapons of the ruler.

L. 21:

šumma iṣ-ri¹²² imitti inammir¹²³ ul-lu-uṣ lib-bi ummāni.

"If the border to the right is resplendent, rejoicing of the heart of my army."

The two explanatory columns read:

nu-um-ru
"brilliancy"

ḥu-ud lib-bi
"joy of the heart"

i. e., the 'brilliancy' of the border of the liver suggests the 'joy' of the army. The word in the first column thus offers a confirmation of the reading *inammir*, while the second column furnishes a synonym to *ulluṣ libbi*.

L. 22:

šumma kabittu imitti atar¹²⁴ dannu¹²⁵ ul-lu-uṣ lib-bi ummāni.

¹²² Iṣ-ri is clearly the designation of the border (or circumference) of the liver.

¹²³ Written LAḤ(ir) = *inammir* (cf. Brünnow, No. 8145). On the color of the liver see below p. 306.

¹²⁴ DIRIG = *atāru* (Brünnow, No. 3729).

¹²⁵ Written GAR-KALAG according to Brünnow (No. 12088), like KALAG (Brünnow, No. 6194) alone. The reading of the first column *atar nam-ru* suggests that GAR-KALAG may be read *namru*. On the basis of this passage alone, however, it is hazardous to assume this value, since the first column frequently suggests a synonym in preference to the word used in the omen. At all events the meaning is perfectly clear and the difference between *dannu* and *namru* is not of any moment in this instance.

"If the liver to the right is very firm, rejoicing of the heart of my army."

The explanatory columns read:

atar nam-ru
"very shining"

ḥu-ud lib-bi
"joy of heart"

The interesting text from this point on is unfortunately defective, and while some of the lines can be partially restored, we are unable to carry on the analysis for the rest of the text in the same complete manner as we have done hitherto. However, even in its defective condition, the text furnishes some further elucidations of the principles of Babylonian hepatoscopy and of the application of these principles to specific signs observed on the liver. It is worth while, therefore, to attempt an interpretation.

L. 24 reads:

šumma KAK-TI¹²⁶ ša imitti u[šumēli ḥalkā(?)¹²⁷] ši-lim-tum.¹²⁸
"If the KAK-TI to the right and [left are destroyed], annihilation."

The two explanatory columns read:

ummanâte ma'dûti¹²⁹
"numerous hosts"

zu-ḫu-ru-ti ašaridi¹³⁰
"supremacy of my general"

The connection between the first column and the sign observed is obscure, and must remain so till the reading and exact meaning of KAK(ti) can be determined.

L. 25 reads:

šumma ina ḫaḫḫad marti di-ḥu nadi-ma[ḥud lib-bi
zanân šamê].

"If at the head of the gall-bladder there is a hole and
[joy of heart, plentiful rain]."

The explanatory columns enabling us to restore the end of the line from the faint traces read:

¹²⁶ See above p. 295, n. 66.

¹²⁷ Read ḤA-A (with plural sign) = ḥalkā, like CT, XX, 45, 18. Cf. also Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 293, n. 7.

¹²⁸ Of frequent occurrence in omen texts, e.g., CT, XX, 2, rev. 6; 6, 9-11; 7, 19-21; Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 47, 15; 12, 16, etc. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 299, n. 14.

¹²⁹ ERIM with plural sign (Brünnow, No. 8170) followed by ZUN with plural sign (Brünnow, No. 8623). Read, therefore, ummanâte ma'dûti.

¹³⁰ SAG-KALAG with MU as suffix of first person = ašaridi (Brünnow, No. 3619).

di-ḥu lib-bu
"hole inside"

ḥu-ud lib-bi zanān¹³¹ šamē
"joy of heart, plentiful rain"

L. 25:

šumma kabittu imitti i-ḥaš-[šī-šu¹³² ul-lu-uš lib-bi um-māni].

"If the liver to the right [is resplendent, rejoicing of the heart of my army]."

The explanatory columns read:

ḥi-iš-ša-tum
"resplendency"

ul-lu-uš lib-bi
"rejoicing of the heart"

The association of ideas is the same as in ll. 21–22, and also in the following line, where the 'brilliant,' 'shining' color of the part of the liver singled out suggests enlargement and success. The color of the liver, as is well known, varies considerably according to pathological conditions in the sacrificial animal, and it is interesting to note that in Greek and Roman hepatoscopy likewise the color of the liver enters into the interpretation of the signs observed. Aeschylus,¹³³ for example, in describing the benefits conferred on mankind by Prometheus includes therein his teaching mankind to derive omens from the inspection of the entrails,¹³⁴ specifying the doctrine as follows:

"The smoothness of the entrails, having what color would be pleasing to the deities, the well-formed and variegated character of the gall-bladder and lobe."

¹³¹ SUR (an) = zanān; cf. Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 59, 7, where we find the phonetic writing za-na-an šamē. The combination ŠUR AN-E frequently occurs in the astrological texts, e. g., Craig, *Astrological-Astronomical Texts*, Pl. 27 (81, 2-4, 206), rev. 21. Virolleaud's reading (*L'Astrologie Chaldéenne*, fasc. 8, p. 11, 10) izannun šamē is to be corrected accordingly.

¹³² From ḥašāšu for which the ideogram is HI-LI (V R. 39, 8g) and which is therefore a synonym of kuzbu, ulšu, šullulu (from alālu)—all having the meaning of 'splendor,' 'enlargement,' 'joy,' and the like. See Brünnow, Nos. 824–48.

¹³³ *Prometheus*, ll. 495–97. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 350.

¹³⁴ Σπλάγχνα 'entrails' which by the side of ἱερά 'sacred parts' or ἱερεῖα 'victims' is the term used by Greek writers and never ἥπαρ, just as the Latin writers speak of the *exta* and not of *jecur* when they refer to hepatoscopy in general. Such a usage no doubt points to the inclusion of other organs—as lungs, heart, and entrails—in divination rites, and yet it is noteworthy that when in Greek or Latin writers *specific* details of the inspection of an animal for divination purposes are given, the organ in all except a very few cases specified is the liver, and all specific signs observed are such as are found on the liver, showing, therefore, that here, too, it is the liver which is *par excellence* the organ of revelation. See the passages in Blecher, *De Extispicio*, pp. 3–32. Indeed, according to Thulin, *Die etruskische Disciplin*, Vol. II, pp. 44, 45, other organs outside of the liver are rarely referred to and appear to have been consulted only when showing abnormal phenomena, whereas in ordinary cases the examination was limited to the liver. See also Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 216.

L. 26:

šumma martu nam-ba-[ta-at kima(?) . . . ul-lu-uš lib-bi ummāni].

"If the gall-bladder shines like(?) . . . rejoicing of the heart of my army."

The adjoining two columns reading

nam-ba-tu
"brilliant"

ul-lu-uš lib-bi
"joy of heart"

require no further comment.

L. 27:

šumma martu širu [libû¹³⁵ rubû libbu duḥudšu ika-šad(?)]¹³⁶

"If the flesh of the gall-bladder [is fatty, the ruler through his strength will conquer(?)]."

Cols. I and II to this line read:

li-bu-u
"fat"

duḥ-du
"abundance"

The fatty gall-bladder or its fatty appearance is interpreted as pointing to prosperity and abundance.

L. 28:

šumma ina imitti pantî¹³⁷ šul-[ul-lu ebûr mâtî maḥîra nap-ša ibašši].¹³⁸

"If to the right the liver surface is [resplendent—the produce of the land will be high-priced]."

¹³⁵ Read ŠAL-LU which according to Craig, *Assyr. Relig. Texts*, Vol. II, Pl. II, obv. 13 is to be read li-bu-u 'fat'—precisely as the explanatory column has it. See Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 105; and Zimmern, *Beiträge*, p. 172 (No. 57, n. 6). The word occurs frequently in incantation and ritual texts.

¹³⁶ The word duḥ-du 'abundance' in Col. II of this line suggests the restoration of this line according to CT, XX, 50, 17, and Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 95, 10. Practically the same phrase is found also CT, XX, 2, rev. 8: 49, rev. 32 (also to be restored Pl. 6 [Rm 86] 6) Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 8, rev. 13. See also the omen in the Inscription of Nabonidus, VR. 63, Col. II, 18 and the comment in Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 257, n. 2, and p. 327, n. 5. The restoration would appear in the text as

NUN ŠA SI-SI-KI-(šu) KUR (ad)

¹³⁷ BA=pantû, the name of the liver surface on which the gall-bladder, the biliary, and hepatic ducts are found, and all the other parts and chief phenomena of the liver, but which, according to modern anatomical nomenclature is the hind or inferior surface, whereas the Babylonians, because this surface was first seen upon opening a sheep, called it the "upper" surface or "face" of the liver, and the other side the "back." The word pantû from being the chief side of the liver came to be used in a general way for the liver. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 227, n. 2, and the writer's article, "Signs and Names of the Liver in Babylonia," ZA, XX, pp. 112-27.

¹³⁸ The restoration suggested by the reading in Col. II and the passages III R. 54, No. 3, 1-3, though of course a variant phrase like l. 3 maḥîra ina-pu-uš (cf. III R. 60, 73) is also possible. See a similar passage in our text Pl. 41, Col. V, 15, na-pa-aš m aḥîri.

Cols. I and II read:

šul-ul-lu^{138a}
"resplendent"

maḥīru¹³⁹ nap-šu
"high price"

The sign again refers to the high coloring of the liver or, more precisely, of the surface of the liver, which is explained as pointing to commercial prosperity. High prices in ancient Babylonia appear to have been indicative of "good times"—a financial boom.

L. 29:

šumma ḳabal nipti ana[elānu larû¹⁴⁰ ibaši rubû ina ḥarrāni illiku ikašad].¹⁴¹

"If in the middle of the hepatic duct above there is a branch, the ruler on his expedition will conquer]."

Cols. I and II read:

la-ru-u
"branch"

ki-šit-tum
"conquest"

The association of ideas appears to rest on the fact that the subsidiary duct branches out from the middle of the hepatic duct on the 'upper' side—"middle" and 'upper' prognosticating a favorable issue.

^{138a} The ideogram of this word being, according to Brünnow, No. 8248, 𒌦-𒌦 (see above p. 306, n. 132), there can be no doubt as to its general meaning, as 'shining' and the like. Examples of verbal forms of alālu in the same sense *CT*, XX, 5, 13, 22-25 (i-tal-la-lu-ši i-tal-lu-ka, etc.), Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete*, No. 8, rev. 11.

¹³⁹ KI-LAM, the common ideogram for maḥīru (Brünnow, No. 9803) so constantly occurring in business documents.

For napšu and forms of the verb in combination with maḥīru see Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 710b. In omen texts we find as interpretations also (a) maḥīru iṣaḥir, Craig, *Astrol.-Astron. Texts*, Pl. 2, 25, 27, 40, etc., and (b) maḥīra mātu inapuš, Craig, Pl. 21, 16; III R. 60, 73.

¹⁴⁰ In view of passages like *CT*, XX, 11 (K. 6393) 7; 11 (K. 6724) 18-19; 18 (K. 12471) 3; 24 (K. 3676), obv. 4-5; 25, 5-6; 28, 2, 6, there can be no doubt of the restoration of anaAN-TA-(nu) [=elānu-] PA TUK (ši).

What a PA looks like is shown by the diagram *CT*, XX, 28, which, besides furnishing a proof that GIB is the hepatic duct, makes it clear that PA is a subsidiary hepatic duct. The diagram illustrates a variety of such subsidiary ducts branching out to the right, in the middle and at the base of the hepatic duct, both above (elānu) and below (šaplānu). One of the common equivalents of PA is ḥaṭṭu 'scepter.' From this to some such meaning as 'branch' is only a short step, while the reading larû in the first column may reasonably be taken to be the phonetic value of PA when applied to subsidiary duct. See Jastrow, II, p. 297, n. 1. The word in question is found here for the first time, and it is therefore idle to speculate as to its fundamental meaning. We may provisionally enter it as 'branch'—to fit the context. The omen texts furnish quite a number of words not found elsewhere, as e. g., zibu 'club,' diḥu 'hole,' kaskasu 'flake,' niptû hepatic duct, niru common bile duct, etc., so that it is not surprising to come across another.

¹⁴¹ Restored according to *CT*, XX, 39, 1. See above p. 292, n. 45.

L. 30:

šumma MAŠ kima [ku-ul-ti ul-lu-uš lib-bi ummāni].

"If the papillary appendix is like [a kultu rejoicing of the heart of my army]."

Cols. I and II:

ku-ul-tu¹⁴²

ul-lu-uš lib-bi ummāni
"rejoicing of heart in my army."

For the next eleven lines the third column is lacking altogether and there is not much to be made of Cols. I and II, which are likewise badly broken.

L. 31, Cols. I and II:

li-[me]-tum¹⁴³
"surrounding"

ašibûte-šu ippaṭarû (?) ẽ-
ṭir¹⁴⁴ ili
"its inhabitants will be freed
through the protection of a god"

For ll. 32-35 only the second column remains:

[li-me (?)]-tum

bar-ri-e¹⁴⁵ bit amêli
"superabundance of the house
of man"

la ka-šit-tum
"no conquest"
la ka-šit-tum
"no conquest"

sa-kip-tum lumun libbi¹⁴⁶
"overthrow, misfortune"

¹⁴²Without the third column, it is impossible to determine the meaning of this word which I have not met with as yet elsewhere in the omen texts. Langdon, *JAOS*, XXVII, p. 97, n. 3, thinks it may be some object of wood. This is possible, though his supposition that the comparisons in these texts are usually with such objects is erroneous, cf. Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, pp. 79, 85, 103, etc. The comparison is very frequently with small animals or with parts of animals or with fruits, or, in fact, with almost anything.

¹⁴³Limetum points to a verb ilamî in the first part of the line devoted to the description of the sign. The catch-words of the interpretation begin with the following KU-A with plural sign, perhaps to be read ašibûte. Note that the duplicate Rm 2, 466 has GAB-MEŠ=paṭrû.

¹⁴⁴KAR (ir) pointing to the reading ẽṭir ili; cf. Brünnow, No. 7739. The verb ẽṭêru occurs not infrequently in omen texts, e. g., *CT*, XX, 14, 8-27, 9, where ẽṭêru with ekêmu, šatik and kabâsu all are entered as synonyms and as possible readings for KAR.

¹⁴⁵Cf. i-bir-ri as the interpretation of an omen, Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, 88, 17 and 94, rev. 6; also ub-bir (l. 4), ub-bir-šu (l. 5).

¹⁴⁶ŠA-HUL=lumun libbi. The two expressions sakiptum and lumun libbi are of course introduced as alternatives. Langdon (*JAOS*, XXVII, p. 97), who misses the point here as in other instances, attempts to combine them.

Cols. I and II of ll. 36 and 37 are too fragmentary to be considered.

L. 38:

a-[ru-ur-tum (?)]
"curse"

L. 39:

[si-(?)-si-il-tum]¹⁴⁷

a-ru-ur-tum
"curse"

L. 40:

ša-[laḥ-]tum¹⁴⁸
"tear"

maš-la-'a-tum¹⁴⁹
"capture"

With the help of various passages in omen texts,¹⁵⁰ the third column can be restored with great probability as follows:

šumma [irru saḥirūti imitti šal-ḥu maš-la-'a-ti ummāni].
"If the network is torn apart, capture of my army."

¹⁴⁷ Restored from Rm 131, 5 (published by Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 20 of Texts). This fragment is part of a text *much like ours*, so that here, too, we must beware of taking the words of the two columns as synonyms, *as has hitherto been done*. They represent the catch-word of the sign noted and of the interpretation of liver omens respectively, belonging to a lost third column. Whether the entire text was a duplicate is doubtful, even though several lines (36-42=Rm 131, 2-9) agree. There is no agreement between this fragment and any of the lines preserved on the reverse of our text. I hope to treat this fragment more fully on some other occasion. No doubt further investigation will show that there are other lexicographical texts, hitherto regarded as furnishing synonymous expressions, which belong to the same category. Note that in Rm 131, 5 the first sign *si* is missing, but the restoration suggested by Delitzsch, *HWB*, p. 506b seems plausible. I suspect that *si* (?) - *sil-tum* represents a term with which a comparison was instituted in the first part of the corresponding line of Col. III, devoted to the description of the signs noted.

¹⁴⁸ To be restored according to Rm 131, 6. That the second sign (Brünnow, No. 7766) is to be read *laḥ* and not *par* as Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 97b, proposed (who was followed by Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 1093b), or *bir* as Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 89, assumed, may be concluded from the omen report K. 1523 (S. A. Smith, *Keilschrifttexte Asurbanapals*, Vol. III, Pl. 26), *šumma irru saḥirūti šal-ḥu maš-la-'a-ti rubi nidūti ummāni*, i. e., "if the network is torn, capture of the chief (orking), overthrow of my army." The word in the first column having reference to the sign observed, the association is no doubt in our text also between some form of the verb *šalāḥu* and a noun *šalaḥtum*. That the sign is an unfavorable one is distinctly stated in the summary of the signs K. 1523, 15, 16; cf. Jastrow, II, p. 293, n. 6.

¹⁴⁹ Occurring a number of times as the interpretation of an omen, e. g., *CT*, XX, 31, 31, 32 (*maš-la-'a-ti ummāni* and *maš-la-'a-ti ummān nakri*); 16, (K. 6848), 4, 5, where no doubt *ummān* and *ummān nakri* are also to be supplied besides K. 1523, just referred to. These passages show conclusively that the word has some such sense as 'capture' and since we have a word *šallu* 'captive' (Muss-Arnolt, *loc. cit.*, p. 1035b), well vouched for, we need not hesitate to assign the force of 'capture' to *maš-la-'a-tum*. The association of *šalāḥu* with *maš-la-'a-tum* embodies, therefore, a play upon words as well as upon ideas.

¹⁵⁰ See the previous note and compare also K. 4045, 10 (Boissier, *loc. cit.*), *šumma irru saḥirūti imitti parsū u šal-ḥu*, 'if the network to the right is divided and torn.' Ll. 42-44 began with *ša-NIGIN* so that it is permissible from this circumstance also to restore the same signs in ll. 40, 41 and perhaps also in l. 39. The verb, it is to be noted, occurs in the case of other parts of the liver as, e. g., with the *porta hepatis*, *CT*, XX, 31, 31, 32 (*šal-ḥa-t*). In the case of the 'network' the sign indicates that the group of lines and curves are broken up instead of being continuous (*al-kū* as in l. 2), see above p. 293, n. 47a.

L. 41, Cols. I and II:

e-[liš]¹⁵¹ ka-na-šu
"bent above"

u-šur-tum¹⁵²
"defeat"

L. 42, Cols. I and II:

[li-me-]tum¹⁵³
"surrounding"

u-šur-tum
"defeat"

L. 43, Cols. I and II:

[si-ḫi-ir-tu]¹⁵⁴
"surrounding"

[šanê ṭemi]¹⁵⁵
"loss of reason"

The reverse of the tablet which we have now reached comprising Cols. IV to VI is also in a most lamentable condition, without a single line complete for all three columns.¹⁵⁶

For ll. 1-10 the third column is missing entirely and for the first line also Cols. V and VI¹⁵⁷ of the explanatory columns. Ll. 2-10 read so far as preserved as follows:

2. tal-lu

3. nim-ru
"shining"

4. ia-ar-tum¹⁵⁸
"flow" (?)

zanân[šamê]¹⁵⁹
"rain from heaven"

¹⁵¹ According to Rm 131, 7. Contrast to šaplis kanāšu (above Col. I, l. 18).

¹⁵² Cf. Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 51, 15; mātu u-šur-ti ramāni-ša iṣabat as a distinctly unfavorable omen as shown by l. 13 where for a similar omen we find mātu ḫušaḫḫu immar "the land will see famine." Ušurtu is therefore to be derived from ašaru 'to humble,' 'lower,' and the like.

¹⁵³ Rm 131, 8.

¹⁵⁴ Rm 131, 9, which adds as a synonym li-me-tum—an indication that in the third column an ideograph was used—probably Brūnnow, No. 10323—which could be read either as lamû (No. 10334) or saḫāru (No. 10339) as, e. g., Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 92, 13.

¹⁵⁵ Rm 131, 9 reads šan-e vṣ-[vṣ]=ṭe-e-mi as Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 47, 2, compared with the parallel passages CT, XX, 10, 4 and 12, 14 [K. 9213] (ša-ni ṭe-me) 27, 11. The third column is perhaps to be restored on the basis of Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 92, 13, in combination with CT, XX, 10, 4 as follows:

šumma irru saḫirāti iṣtenit(?) issaḫirā nu-kur mil-ki šanê ṭe-e-mi ina ḫarrāni illik taḫ-pu-da,
i. e., "if the network is altogether (?) surrounded, perverted judgment, (and) loss of reason in the expedition that thou planest"—but this cannot of course be regarded as certain. See Jastrow, II, pp. 295 f., n. 6.

¹⁵⁶ How far Rm 131 ran parallel with our text it is impossible to say, but presumably not very far since there is no correspondence between Rm 131 and any portions of Cols. V and VI of the reverse of K. 2235 etc.

¹⁵⁷ Note that on the reverse it is Col. IV that furnishes the omens, Col. VI the catch-word of omen and Col. V the catch-word of the interpretation.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. CT, XX, 15 (K. 6848), 6 [mê] a-a-r-ti from āru (Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 3b, and see Jastrow, II, p. 339, n. 5.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. above, p. 306, n. 131.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 5. | e-rim-ma-tum ¹⁶⁰
"chain" (?) | |
| 6. | (giš)KU
"weapon" | zi-[bu] ¹⁶¹
"club" |
| 7. | ekimtu ¹⁶²
"misplacement" | ekimtu ¹⁶³ [ummāni]
"taking away [of my army]" |
| 8. | kamtum ¹⁶⁴ ekimtu ¹⁶⁵
"inclosure misplaced" | da-ša[-tum] ¹⁶⁶
"distress" |
| 9. | kamtum ṣalmat ¹⁶⁷ u kanšat ¹⁶⁸
"inclosure black and bent" | erū ¹⁶⁹ nakru ušēši-šu
"the enemy will drive out the strong one" |

¹⁶⁰ See the passages in Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 102b. Presumably in the third column the comparison was made between a part or some sign on the liver and a 'chain.'

¹⁶¹ (Giš) KU, as already indicated above p. 303, n. 118, is the most common sign for a marking on the liver which, however, is not to be read kakku, but zibu as Boissier recognized. See the author's full note on the subject (Jastrow, II, p. 235, n. 6). The zi[bu] in Col. V is not to be taken as the equivalent of (giš) KU as Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 74, proposed, but as the catch-word of the interpretation, based on the fact that (giš) KU = zibu 'club.' The omen, no doubt, read to the effect that if at such a part of the liver there was a zibu, through the 'club,' i. e., in war, the king or his army or the enemy—as the case may be—would triumph. This play between a marking designated as a kind of weapon, and the 'weapons' of kings and soldiers as the symbol of warfare, is constant in omen texts, e. g., CT, XX, 3, 11; 10, 2-3; etc., etc. The occurrence of zi-bu in the column furnishing the catch-word of the interpretation points to the reading zibu and not kakku in the interpretation of the omens as well as in the designation of markings. I therefore adopt this reading for (giš) KU everywhere in the omen texts.

¹⁶² KAR(tum) = ekimtu; cf. Brünnow, No. 1740.

¹⁶³ KAR(tu) = ekimtu. The stem ekēmu 'remove,' 'misplace' is of very frequent occurrence in the omen texts and is generally expressed by the same sign as here, namely, KAR. The reading is established by the phonetic element im which is often added, e. g., CT, XX, 15, 30; 30, 13, etc., etc., while the noun is indicated by the addition of tum (CT, XX, 29, rev. 11), tu (CT, XX, 13, rev. 14; 33, 111, 112: 26, obv. 17), ti (CT, XX, 1, 27). Note also the gloss e-ke-mu to KAR (CT, XX, 14, 8 and 27, 9). In the third column no doubt the interpretation was ekimtu ummān nakri "capture of the enemy's army" as CT, XX, 29, rev. 9, and 33, 112; also to be supplied 13 rev. 13 or ummāni 'my army' as CT, XX, 33, 111; 26, obv. 17. The verb ekēmu is used of various parts of the liver (a) of the biliary duct (NA), e. g., CT, XX, 1, 26; (b) of the hepatic duct (GIR), e. g., Pl. 18 (Sm. 1520, rev. 12; 21 (83, 1-18, 433), 11-12; (c) of the KA-DUG(GA) e. g., *ibid.*, l. 13; (d) of the hepatic vein (DAN), *ibid.*, l. 14; (e) of the ductus choledochus (ME-NI) *ibid.*, l. 16, etc., etc.

¹⁶⁴ Kamtu which occurs in this and the following lines must be the designation of a species of markings on the liver, not unlike a diḥu 'hole.' See Jastrow, II, p. 312, n. 9. I take it from the stem kamū 'inclose.'

¹⁶⁵ KAR(tum) as in the preceding line.

¹⁶⁶ So also restored by Langdon, *JAOS*, XXVII, p. 99.

¹⁶⁷ Mi(at) which occurs also CT, XX, 27, 13 and 33, 99-101 and 103, 104 in connection with the hepatic duct is to be read ṣalmat 'dark.' Note that CT, XX, obv. 29, 14 we find pišu 'white' said of the hepatic duct, and arḫu 'green' said of a hole in the 'network' inclosure (Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 87, l. 1 (K. 8272 and also K. 3827). See Jastrow II, p. 341, n. 7.

¹⁶⁸ GAM(at) for which the reading kanšat is suggested by the occurrence of kanāšu in our text (CT, XX, 39, 17 and 40, 41) as well as the phonetic complement iš to GAM (CT, XX, 26, 4 and 32, 5). See Brünnow, No. 7322 and see also CT, XX, 18 (K. 1520), 5 where we must no doubt read GAM(at) as in our passage. For other occurrences of GAM see Jastrow II, p. 334, n. 2.

¹⁶⁹ AT-ḪAL contrasted (Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 8, 2-3) to enšū 'weak,' and

10. kamtum ħur-ru-ur-tum ¹⁷⁰	kišitti kâti ¹⁷¹
“inclosure hollowed out”	“conquest”

L. 11:

kam-tum eli kamti	kamâte u-a kamâte-šunu ikka- mû(?) ¹⁷²
“inclosure” over “inclosure”	“with inclosures of woe are their inclosures inclosed”

From here on the fourth column is partially preserved, and with the help of the fifth and sixth columns, and of parallel passages, the lines can to a certain extent be completed:

L. 12, Col. IV, reads:

šumma ina imitti [niptû bu-bu-'u-tum nadat dimtu ana
mât šarri êrub].¹⁷³

“If on the right side of [the hepatic duct there flows serum, sorrow
will enter the land of the ruler].”

To this line Cols. V and IV read:

bu-bu-'u-tum ¹⁷⁴	di-im-tum
“serum”	“tear”

The association of ideas rests on the play between bubûtum as a ‘flowing’ of some kind and tears, while the other meaning of bubûtu ‘hunger’ and distress in general no doubt also enters as a factor.

therefore to be read erû according to Brûnnow, No. 4168; it is found combined with the same verb as here in Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 6, 13; 98, 19 (with phonetic complement ši); 219, 14, etc.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. ħa-ri-ir CT, XX, 50, 5, 6 of the *processus pyramidalis*.

¹⁷¹ Corresponding, no doubt, to kât-su ikašad in the interpretation as, e. g., CT, XX, 47, 55.

¹⁷² LAL-MEŠ u-a LAL-MEŠ-šu-nu LAL-MEŠ. An exceedingly difficult line for which see CT, XX, 21 (83, 1-18, 433), 7, and Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 124. Only so much may be regarded as certain, that LAL, occurring three times, rests on the play between kamtum and the meaning kamû ‘inclose’ vouched for for the sign in question. Cf. Brûnnow, No. 10094. Cf. S. A. Smith, *Miscellaneous Assyrian Texts*, p. 22 (K. 258), 4. LAL (mu) = ikkamu and l. 28 ina ka-ma-a-ti. In place of u-a the parallel CT, XX, 21 has the sign Brûnnow, No. 10251 — the usual one for u-a ‘alas,’ ‘woe,’ etc.

¹⁷³ Completed according to CT, XX, 33, 101. Cf. also ll. 102-5. Traces of aḫr = niptû ‘hepatic duct’ are visible.

¹⁷⁴ For bubu'tu as the liquid — gall and other juices — in the gall-bladder and in the various ducts, see Jastrow, II, p. 334, n. 4.

L. 13, Col. IV, may be restored as follows:

šumma ina ƙaƙƙad NA di-[ƙu šakin zunnu izanun šamû
ina reš arĥi ša-pi-ik].¹⁷⁵

"If at the head of the biliary duct [there is a hole, the heavens will cause rain to come down in abundance at the beginning of the month]."

Cols. V and VI to this line read:

di-ƙu¹⁷⁶
"hole"

zu-un-nu¹⁷⁷
"rain"

L. 14, Col. IV:

šumma ina imitti pantî¹⁷⁸ sul[-lu¹⁷⁹ šakin aššat amêli
a-ka-a ul-lad].¹⁸⁰

"If on the right side of the liver surface there is a 'street'(?), the wife of a man will give birth to a cripple."

Cols. V and VI:

sul-lu
"street"

a-ku-u'i-al-lad
"cripple will be born"

L. 15, Col. IV:

šumma ina imitti pantî sul-[lu dag-šu¹⁸¹ šakin na-pa-aš
maĥiri ibaši].

"If on the right side of the liver surface [there is a pierced 'street'(?)] prices will be high."

¹⁷⁵ For the restoration see the duplicate K. 4432, 3 in combination with Thompson, *Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers*, No. 139, rev. 3, and Craig, *Astrological-Astronomical Texts*, Pl. 68 (Rm. 104), obv. 12, etc.

¹⁷⁶ A most common designation for a species of markings on the liver, for which the usual ideograph is BUBU (Brünnow, No. 8632). For the proof that it is a hole see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 237.

¹⁷⁷ The neo-Babylonian duplicate K. 4432 reads:

zu-un-[nu iz-za-nun] šamû ina reš arĥi ša[-pi-ik]

"rain will be abundant, the heavens at the beginning of the month will pour down."

¹⁷⁸ BA = pantû 'liver surface.' See above p. 307, n. 137.

¹⁷⁹ Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 118, discusses this term, but his conclusions are not satisfactory. The sulu of which K. 2090 furnishes a design is clearly again a species of markings on the liver, and in view of the fact that we have GIR = pa da nu 'road' as the name of one kind of markings, I would suggest identifying the designation with the well-known sullû 'street.' See Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 760a.

¹⁸⁰ Restored according to K. 258 (S. A. Smith, *Miscellaneous Assyrian Texts*, p. 22), obv. 26; cf. Delitzsch, *HWB*, p. 52b, whose suggestion of akû 'cripple' I follow, though of course it is possible that some other bodily defect is intended.

¹⁸¹ Cf. above p. 293, n. 51.

Cols. V and VI:

sul-lu dak-šu
"pierced street"

na-pa-aš maḥīri¹⁸²
"high price"

L. 16, Col. IV:

šumma ina išid ṣēri ubāni [. . . la itanpuḥ Adad iraḥiṣ
u-lu aššat amēli zikara ul-lad].¹⁸³

"If at the base of the back of the *processus pyramidalis*
does not shine forth, Adad will cause an overflow, or the wife of a man
will give birth to a male."

Cols. V and VI read:

la itanpuḥ^{183a} ri-ih-šu¹⁸⁴ aššat amēli zikara ul-lad
"not shining forth" "overflow" (or) "the wife of a man gives birth
to a male."

L. 17, Col. IV, can be partially restored as follows:

šumma irru saḥirūti e-[bi-ma¹⁸⁵ di-ik-šu¹⁸⁶ kima zibi tuš-
tap-pal zibē ummāni išakanū].

"If the network is inclosed and a point [like a club is set deep, the
clubs of my army will prevail]."

¹⁸² See above p. 303, n. 139. The neo-Babylonian duplicate has on the contrary ru (a t)
= n a d a t maḥīri 'low price.'

¹⁸³ For the restoration see CT, XX, 3, 3 and 13; 32, 57; 33, 85, 97-98, RA (iṣ) which a
passage like ours — explained in Col. VI as ri-ih-šu — shows is to be read iraḥiṣ. Cf.
Brünnow, No. 6361. The phrase Adad iraḥiṣ is also frequent in astrological-astronomical
omens and reports, e. g., Craig, *Astrological-Astronomical Texts*, p. 63, 24-29, 57, 12; 60 (K.
3551), 5; 44, obv. 10, 23, etc.; Thompson, *Reports of Astrologers*, etc., Nos. 24, 1 (RA [iṣ]) and
215 rev. 2 (i - r a - ḥ i - iṣ) etc., etc.

^{183a} KAR-KAR = i - t a n - p u - ḥ u (Brünnow, No. 3188). Cf. CT, XX, 1, 1.

¹⁸⁴ In the text this word appears in Col. VI, but it clearly is the catch-word of the
interpretation Adad iraḥiṣ and therefore belongs to Col. V, alongside with aššat
amēli zikara ullad, which must be taken as referring to an alternative interpretation
like CT, XX, 39, 10 (see above p. 298). In the neo-Babylonian duplicate the correct position
of the word is clearly indicated by the omission of the dividing-line between the two
columns. This duplicate also adds pū-šu maṣū 'with a large mouth.' See III R.
65, 27, rev., where among birth portents we note a child born with a KA SI, i. e., KA = pū
'mouth,' and SI = maṣū 'large' (see above p. 298, n. 90), according to Brünnow, No. 3395,
corresponding, therefore, to SI = maṣū (Brünnow, No. 11872) in our text, though in
both cases a form of the verb en-šu 'weak' is also possible (Brünnow, Nos. 3384 and 11870),
and perhaps in view of II R. 27, 52c-d SI = en-šu ša uz-ni, i. e., 'weak, said of the ear'
in the sense of 'defective' is to be preferred.

¹⁸⁵ For e-bi, compare the frequent occurrence in the omens attached to the prayers or
rather the oracles published by Knudtzon (*Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott*), Nos. 1,
rev. 14 and 16; 2, rev. 10; 29, rev. 16 and 19; 32, rev. 5; 33, rev. 10, etc. It is no doubt the same
verb as underlies [e-] ba-at (CT, XX, 39, 14). See also above p. 300, n. 97, and Jastrow, II
p. 305, n. 7.

¹⁸⁶ Di-ik-šu suggested by the word in Col. VI, for which see above p. 293, n. 52. It is,
of course, possible and even probable that instead of the noun a verbal form of the under-

Cols. V and VI:

di-ik-šu
"split"

zi-bu
"club"

L. 18:

šumma ina šapal marti ša imitti zi-[iḫ-tum¹⁸⁷ nadat bar-tum ina ʔkalli ibaši].

"If at the lower part of the gall-bladder on the right there is a sharp point(?) . . . revolt of my army."

Cols. V and VI:

zi-iḫ-tum
"spur" (?)

bar-tum¹⁸⁸
"revolt"

L. 19, Col. IV:

šumma martu ši-iḫ-ši malat¹⁸⁹ a-su-u ana marši ḫāt-su la ub-bal].¹⁹⁰

"If the gall-bladder [is full of impurity, the physician shall not apply his hand to the sick person]."

Cols. V and VI:

ši-iḫ-ši
"impurity"

mur-šu
"sickness"

The association of ideas is clearly based on the sickly looking gall-bladder, and the passage incidentally helps us to specify the sense of the stem šaḫāšu which thus turns out to be a close parallel to the Hebrew שֶׁשׁ 'abomination.'

lying stem was used. Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 75, by taking diḫšu and zibu erroneously as synonyms, though elsewhere (pp. 124, 125) he suspects that the two first columns on obverse and reverse of our text cannot embody synonyms in all cases, misses the point entirely.

For the conjectural restoration at the end of the line see Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 45, 6 and 8, and *CT*, XX, 2, rev. 4-5 and 7, 15. The term zibu 'club' (see above p. 303, n. 118) shows at all events that (giš) ku = kakku or zibu occurred in the interpretation, while the use of zi-bu in Col. V adds further proof that (giš) ku, when occurring in omen texts, whether as designation of a species of markings in the description of the omen or in the interpretation, is to be read zibu and not kakku. See above p. 312, n. 161.

¹⁸⁷ The sign zi still to be seen, so that the restoration, in view of the word in Col. VI can hardly be doubtful.

¹⁸⁸ For bar-tum 'revolt' see Jastrow, II, p. 339, n. 4.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. III R. 65, No. 1, rev. 11, where among birth omens the case is mentioned of a newborn infant ši-iḫ-ši ma-li.

¹⁹⁰ Restored according to *CT*, XX, 10, 6, and Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 47, 5-6. See Jastrow, II, p. 296. As an alternative one might suggest maršu šuātu imât 'that sick man will die,' like Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 67, 28.

L. 20:

šumma martu mu-un-[ta-ṭi-ra-at(?) Adad irabiš].¹⁹¹

"If the gall-bladder appears moist (?) . . . Adad will cause an overflow."

Cols. V and VI:

me-iṭ-ru¹⁹²
"moist"

ri-iḥ-ṣu
"overflow"

L. 21:

šumma irru saḥirūti ešērit¹⁹³[ma kima um-ša-ti¹⁹⁴ . . . ekimtu ummāni].¹⁹⁵

"If the network consists of ten (parts) [and is pointed (?) like a thorn (?) . . . capture of my army]."

Cols. V and VI:

um-ša-tum
"thorn(?)"

ekimtum¹⁹⁶
"capture"

There lurks in the association evidently a play of some kind upon umṣatu which is vouched for in the sense of 'distress, need,' and as the name of a sickness (Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 10a), but which is likewise the name of a plant (V R. 27, No. 7, 61). Since it is a synonym of rubatum and elpitum (see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 30, n. 4), it perhaps designates a thorn.

L. 22:

šumma DAN¹⁹⁷ kima [kak-ku-tum^{197a} . . .

"If the portal vein is like a kakkutu."

¹⁹¹Suggested again by the occurrence of riḥṣu as the catch-word of the interpretation as above, p. 315.

¹⁹²Cf. Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 535a. Col. IV probably contained the participle, I, 2, of maṭāru, namely mu-un-ta-ṭi-ra-at (or muntaṭrat) for muntaṭirat.

¹⁹³The 'network' consists of a varying number of curves and lines from five to as many as seventeen being mentioned in the texts. Cf. Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 93, where ll. 16-17, 'ten' parts as in our passage are indicated. The usual number seems to be fourteen. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 256, n. 4.

¹⁹⁴For the restoration see Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 91, 6 (K. 3805) where the 'network' is compared to various objects.

¹⁹⁵See above p. 312, n. 163. If the omen is favorable, the interpretation would correspondingly be ekimtu ummān nakri.

¹⁹⁶KAR(tum) ekimtum like above, p. 312.

¹⁹⁷For DAN = dannu 'hepatic vein' see above p. 296, n. 75.

^{197a}Comparisons of parts of the liver with all kinds of objects, instruments, vessels, animals, etc., are very frequent in omen texts. See, e. g., Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, pp. 79 (gall-bladder), 91 (network), 103 (KAK-TI), 104 (DAN), 139, 8-9; 141, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, etc., (zibu); CT, XX, 3, 23, 25; 7, 2-5; 10, 15 (hepatic duct), etc.

Cols. V and VI:

kak-ku-tum

piš-la-a-tum¹⁹⁸

The next three lines are taken up with various forms of the markings on the liver known as diḫē 'holes.'¹⁹⁹

L. 23:

šumma šaplānu ma-[ši(?) -ma²⁰⁰ ša imitti(?) diḫu nadi Adad iraḫiṣ].

"If the lower part (of the portal vein (?)) [is large (?) and to the right (?) there is a hole, Adad will cause an overflow]."

Cols. V and VI:

di-ḫu
"hole"

ri-ih-ṣu
"overflow"

L. 24:

šumma šapliš marti ša imitti di-[ḫu ṣalmu nadi Adad zunna danna iraḫiṣ].

"If below the gall-bladder to the right [there is a dark hole, Adad will send a mighty downpour]."

Cols. V and VI:

di-ḫu ṣalmu²⁰¹
"dark hole"

ri-ih-ṣu dan-nu
"mighty overflow"

L. 25:

šumma ina libbi niri^{201a} di[-ḫu libbu diḫu nadi zunnē ina šamē ibašū].²⁰²

"If within the common bile duct [there is a hole within a hole, there will be rain from heaven]."

¹⁹⁸ Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 95, 19, 20 (also to be restored CT, XX, 29, obv. 16), we have a verbal form it-ta-na-p-šal from pašālu for which, since it is used in juxtaposition with ik-bi-is 'depressed,' Boissier suggests 'misplaced.' I am rather inclined to take it in the sense of 'deeply set.' For our word, however, this passage is of no avail. In a lamentation song (Haupt, *Akkadisch-Sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, No. 19, obv. 10) we have an expression aptašilki 'I touch thee' (Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 81, n. 3). Is piš-la-tum perhaps to be connected with this sense? Or has the first sign (Brünnow, No. 6926) also the value maš and are we to read mašlā'tu 'capture' as above? Until we can determine the meaning of kak-ku-tum it is idle to speculate any farther. Is this perhaps also the designation of some prickly or bristling plant suggested by the 'bristling' appearance of the portal vein?

¹⁹⁹ See above, p. 314, n. 176.

²⁰⁰ Traces of ši are to be seen. Cf. im-ta-ši above, p. 298, n. 90.

²⁰¹ Diḫu MI. See above, p. 312, n. 167, and for further uses of MI = ṣalmu cf. Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 70, 1-2 (with the kišād kabitti 'neck of the liver'), 72, 12-13 di-ḫu nadi-ma ṣalmu with the amartu kabitti 'edge of the liver') 67, 34, MI(at) = ṣalmat in connection with the head of the gall-bladder; 87, 2, di-ḫu ṣalmu nadi (with the 'network'), etc., etc.

^{201a} For ME-NI = niru ductus choledochus, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 354, n. 2.

²⁰² For the restoration see the following note.

Cols. V and VI:

di-ḫu libbu di-ḫi
"hole within a hole"

zunnê ibašû²⁰³
"rainstorms will take place"

The last six lines of the tablet are taken up with the various forms of the markings on the liver that are fantastically compared with weapons and therefore called zibê 'clubs.' That these markings follow the three lines devoted to diḫê 'holes' is an indication of a certain order observed in the arrangement of the tablet itself, since 'clubs' and 'holes' represent the two main divisions of the markings on the liver and therefore occur far more frequently than others like padanu 'road'²⁰⁴ sullu 'street'²⁰⁵ (?) dikšu 'point,'²⁰⁶ and the like. The lines in our text in connection with parallel passages from collections of omens furnish the definite proof as set forth in detail elsewhere in a special article by the writer,²⁰⁷ that these 'clubs' according to their shape were compared with the weapons of the gods, frequently mentioned in religious texts and pictured as symbols of the gods on the kudurru monuments or boundary stones.²⁰⁸

Referring the reader for further details to the article in question, we may content ourselves with an enumeration of the weapons with brief explanatory remarks, all the more so since with one exception the important fourth column for these lines which should furnish the sign noted, and the interpretation, is wanting.

L. 26, Col. IV, can be restored as follows:

šumma ina bi-rit ni-ri u [nipti²⁰⁹ KAK-SU-U zibu išitu ša
EN-LIL šakin, EN-LIL išita-šu ka-liš išakan u-lu Adad]
māta i-ra-[ḫi-iš].²¹⁰

²⁰³ Written A-AN-MES GAL-MES. Cf. Craig, *Astrological-Astronomical Texts*, p. 60, obv. 18. zunnê (or mē) ina šame ibašû.

²⁰⁴ See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 237, and 275, n. 1.

²⁰⁵ See above, p. 314, n. 179.

²⁰⁶ Above p. 315.

²⁰⁷ "Notes on Omen Texts" (II. "The Weapons of the Gods"), *AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 103-15.

²⁰⁸ See on these symbols the Introduction to Dr. W. J. Hinkes' work *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I from Nippur* (Philadelphia, 1905), chap. i.

²⁰⁹ Read GIR = niptû, which is not the reading of na as I erroneously held at the time of writing "Notes on Omen Texts," *loc. cit.*, p. 112; see Jastrow, II, p. 279, n. 2. The traces of GIR are quite clear.

²¹⁰ Correct the restoration given in "Notes on Omen Texts" accordingly. On the basis of CT, XX, 3, 13, where we read: šumma GIR šinā-ma ina bi-ri-šu-nu KAK-SU-U

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct [there is a KAK-SU-U, the club of destruction of Enlil, Enlil will bring about destruction everywhere, or Adad will cause an overflow in the land]."

To this line Cols. V and VI read:

KAK-ŠU-U	zibu išitu ²¹¹ ša En-lil
"KAK-SU-U"	"club of destruction of Enlil"

From a text published by Boissier (*Choix de Textes*)²¹² where we read šumma KAK-SU-U zibu išitu ša En-lil, it follows that KAK-SU-U is actually the designation of one of the weapons of Enlil, or at all events is associated with *one* of his weapons, just as elsewhere we learn of a zibu noted on the liver which is designated as the weapon of Ištar (zibu Ištar), and the specific name of which is given in a gloss as di-e-pi.²¹³ In the passage in question KAK-SU-U²¹⁴ is used without any further specification, precisely as elsewhere ūmu šaḫu 'mighty storm' is used

šakin Nergal ikkal, Adad ira-ḫiṣ-ma En-lil amāta-šu ka-liṣ išakan, "If the hepatic duct is doubled and between the two there is a KAK-SU-U, Nergal will destroy, Adad will overflow, and Enlil's command will cause destruction everywhere," it is evident that the words to be seen in Col. IV, māta i-ra[ḫi-iṣ], refer to Adad. We must therefore assume here, as in other cases, an alternative interpretation (cf. *CT*, XX, 33, 97-98) or as in the line just quoted a double interpretation, referring to both Adad and Enlil, and it is possible that Nergal also was introduced. In justification of placing the words zibu išitu ša Enlil immediately after KAK-SU-U and taking them as the description and name of the marking known as KAK-SU-U, we may point to the fragment published by Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 118, referred to in the following note. Enlil also occurs with Nergal in Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 141, 11-12. In all these cases Enlil of Nippur is meant, as is indicated by the writing En-lil which, as Clay has conclusively shown in his article ("Enlil, the God of Nippur," in *AJSL*, XXIII, pp. 269 ff), always designates this deity whose name down to the latest period was pronounced Enlil (from En-lil). In Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 141, 12, we find him, however, designated as EN-E-KUR-RA, i. e., 'lord of Ekurra;' which may, of course, be due to a late copyist. In *CT*, XX, 12 (K. 9213), 4-5, we find (ilu) Bel (Brünnow, No. 1497) which can, of course, stand for Marduk.

²¹¹ Cf. Brünnow, No. 11209, occurring also *CT*, XX, 7, 19-20 išitu ana ummāni imkūt and išitu ana ummān nakri imkūt as well as l. 21, išitu u saḫ-maš-tum (see Jastrow, *Religion*, II, p. 346, n. 10) 'destruction and uprising;' cf. *CT*, XX, 33, 97, 98. Adad ina māt[rubi] irabiṣ u-lu išitu ina māt rubi ibaṣi and Adad ina māt nakri irabiṣ u-lu išitu ina māt nakri ibaṣi—an alternative interpretation (a) either 'Adad will cause an overflow in the ruler's (or enemy's) land or (b) destruction in the ruler's (or enemy's) land will take place,' and where we may assume on the basis of *CT*, XX, 3, 13, that išitu refers to the act of Enlil, just as ilu ina māt rubi (or ina māt nakri ikkal) (*CT*, XX, 33, 99-100) refers, as in *CT*, XX, 3, 13, to Nergal.

²¹² *Choix de Textes*, p. 118 (K. 2089), 2. Cf. Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 46, rev. 4.

²¹³ V R. 63, II, 29-30. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 261, n. 10, and "Notes on Omen Texts" (*AJSL*, XXIII, p. 105). A fuller name of the weapon da-'i-pu za-ai-ri 'overthrower of enemies' occurs as the weapon of Marduk in the *Creation Epic* (Tablet IV, 30, ed. King). A zibu associated with Ištar is also mentioned, *CT*, XX, 48, 39.

²¹⁴ *CT*, XX, 44, 51, KAK-SU-U appears qualified as ekimtum 'misplaced' (see above, p. 312), but occurring in a line which is chiefly devoted to different kinds of markings (see above, p. 319).

to describe a zibu, which, as we know from another passage, consists of a twofold zibu.²¹⁵ Unfortunately, we do not know the phonetic reading for KAK-SU-U nor of any of the four designations of zibê that follow, namely (Col. VI):

L. 28. PAL-SU-U.

L. 29. DI-DI-SU-U.

L. 30. (giš)KU PEŠ(tuš).

L. 31. UT-DI-SU-U.

In the case of all these four designations the adjoining column (Col. V) has

zibu išitu
"club of destruction"²¹⁶

while Col. IV begins in all four lines with the sign ša, which is followed after a break—that appears, however, to have been left *blank*—at the end of the line by the names of gods, of which only the last one is preserved, namely, Šamaš.

I am inclined to conjecture that the ša is an indication that the signs noted for these four lines, as also for the fifth and last one of the tablet, are the same as for l. 26, except that the *character* of the marking varies according to the indications given

²¹⁵ *Inscription der Stele Nabu'naiids* (ed. Messerschmidt), Col. XI, 11-13. See Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts," pp. 106-8, where other occurrences of *am u ša ku* are given.

²¹⁶ Other occurrences of this sign *gugu*(?) = *ištu* in omen texts are as follows: *CT*, XX, 7, 21, *pirištu išitu u saḥ-maš-tum* 'omen of destruction and uprising' to be taken as an abbreviated interpretation for some such phrase as is found *CT*, XX, 3, 13, *Nergal ikkal*, etc., or, as we have assumed for our passage, *Enlil išitu kališ išakan*, etc. Similarly *CT*, XX, 7, 19-20, *ištu ana ummāni imkūt* and *ištu ana ummān nakri* the interpretation is given in an abbreviated form, the term *ištu* being regarded as sufficient to suggest the kind of 'destruction' that is meant; and the same is the case *CT*, XX, 33, 97-98, as well as *CT*, XX, 6 (Sm. 1412), 9-11, which are to be restored according to Pl. 7, 19-21. A further abbreviation occurs Sm. 674 (Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 1425), where we find (l. 4) simply *ištu u saḥmaštum*. In the text Rm 2, 106 (Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 1645) we encounter a *zibu išitu* as a part of the sign noted and which is therefore to be assumed as a term used *in place* of one of the six fuller designations in our text (*CT*, XX, 42, 26-32), though it is curious that no further specification of any deity is added. Since, however, in the preceding line the 'weapon of Šamaš' known as *at-mu-u ki-e-nu* 'just decree' is mentioned, we assume that *zibu išitu*, which thus turns out to be a very general term for a god's weapon, refers here to this same god, Šamaš. Note that *zibu išitu* is to be supplied also for the four following lines in Rm 2, 106, the purpose being to specify the different places near the hepatic duct where the *zibu*, associated with the weapon of Šamaš, appears, and according to which the interpretation varies. *The omen collections are full of such abbreviations*, just as are other religious texts prepared for school purposes. See, e. g., Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, pp. 17, 26, 27, 30-33, etc. *Ištu* also occurs as part of the interpretation of an omen, e. g., Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 226, 15, and the verb (plural) *CT*, XV, 50, 1. See Langdon, *JAOS*, 28, 147, who has, however, not recognized the plural sign in the passage which he there discusses.

in Col. VI. Col. IV for ll. 28–32 if written out would therefore read:

28. šumma ina birit niri u nipti PAL-ŠU-U zibu išitu ša (ilu) šakin, etc.

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct there is a PAL-SU-U, the club of destruction of the god"

29. šumma ina birit niri u nipti DI-DI-SU-U zibu išitu ša (ilu) šakin, etc.

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct there is a DI-DI-SU-U, the club of destruction of the god"

30. [šumma ina birit niri u nipti zibu šalaltuš(?)²¹⁷ zibu išitu ša Ira(?)²¹⁸ šakin Ira ri-šu-ut ummāni illik].

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct there is a 'triple' zibu, the club of destruction of Ira(?), Ira(?) to the help of my army will go."

31. šumma ina birit niri u nipti zibu UT-DI-SU-U zibu išitu ša Šamaš²¹⁹ sakin, etc.

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct there is a UT-DI-SU-U, the club of destruction of Šamaš."

The name of the weapon in the last line (l. 32) written GAB-LAH (𒀭) is to be read saḥmaštu 'uprising.'²²⁰ The first part of Col. IV is therefore to be read:

šumma ina birit niri u nipti saḥmaštum zibu išitu ša Ea šakin, etc.

"If between the common bile duct and the hepatic duct there is an 'uprising' zibu, 'the club of destruction of Ea.'"

²¹⁷ Written PEŠ (Brünnow, No. 11878) the sign for three, and which, therefore, in view of the phonetic complement tuš (Brünnow, No. 10515), I propose to read šalaltuš literally 'three of it' in the sense of 'triple.' What a 'triple' zibu looks like may be seen in the illustration attached to the school text in Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 143. In view of CT XX, 48, 40, it is perhaps to be associated with Sin.

²¹⁸ The traces point to the sign, Brünnow, No. 958, the usual one for the god of pestilence, Ira, who is a form of Nergal, or rather is one of his manifestations. The god is also mentioned in the omen text—also a school text—published by Boissier, *Choix de Textes*, p. 141, 2, which passage, together with CT, XX, 28, obv. 4, suggests the conjectural restoration for the end of the line, though of course other phrases are possible, as, e. g., ri-šu-u-a 'my help' (Boissier, *loc. cit.*, p. 143, 8), or ri-šu-šu ippalkitšu 'his helpers will desert him,' CT, XX, 13, obv. 11–12, etc.

²¹⁹ Note at mû kēnu as the name of the weapon of Šamaš in Rm 2, 106 (see above, p. 321, n. 216). A zibu associated with Šamaš is also mentioned, CT, XX, 48, 36.

²²⁰ Compare Sm 674 (Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 1425) GUGU(?)U GAB-LAH (ḥu) with CT, XX, 7, 21, GUGU U saḥ-maš-tum from which we obtain the equation GAB-LAH (ḥa or ḥu) = saḥmaštum 'uprising.' GAB-LAH as the interpretation of signs noted on the liver is found outside of the passages above referred to under išitu (above, p. 321, n. 216), CT, XX, 31, 35, 36. GAB-LAH (= saḥmaštu) ummāni 'uprising of my army' and GAB-LAH ummān nakri 'uprising of the enemy's army' (also to be supplied, CT, XX, 4 (K. 6689), 7, 8, and Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 220, 2, 3). See also Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, p. 226, 16, 17, etc., etc.

In each of these lines we are furthermore justified in assuming at the end of the fourth column, an indication of what the gods referred to—Ira, Šamaš, and Ea, and the two whose names are not preserved²²¹—would do. All this, however, it must be borne in mind, is not set forth but only tacitly assumed. The chief purpose of the last five lines is to furnish the designations of various forms of 'clubs' observed on the liver and to specify the gods with whose weapons these markings are associated. Cols. V and VI, accordingly, in the case of these five lines, deviate in a measure from the general principle of this school text in supplying us with names of 'clubs' and the associations which they suggest, but not actually with catch-words of the sign and of the interpretation respectively, except in so far as the 'clubs' determine such interpretation. The same is the case with l. 26 where although the sign noted, as well as the interpretation, is written out in full, Col. VI repeats the designation of the 'club,' while the adjoining fifth column gives the name of the god with whose weapon the form of the marking is associated. Considering for a moment the five unidentified names of 'clubs,' it will be observed that four of them end in *su-u*, which appears likewise as the name of a stone²²² occurring in religious texts²²³ and elsewhere. One of the common equivalents of *su* being *erêbu* 'increase' (Brünnow, No. 166), it is reasonable to conclude that this element in the name specifies an 'excess' or large amount of some quality, somewhat like the *Atar* in such combinations as *Atar-ḥāsis* or *Ḥāsis-atra*, 'exceedingly wise.' Proceeding on this hypothesis, *KAK-su-u* might mean 'excessive in deed,'²²⁴ *PAL-su-u* 'excessive in hostility,'²²⁵ *DI-DI-su-u* 'excessive in conquest,'²²⁶ and *UT-DI-*

²²¹ We should expect *Ištar* and *Sin* to be mentioned since both of these together with *Šamaš* occur in the text *CT*, XX, 48, 36-39, several times referred to (above p. 320, n. 213). For *Ištar*'s weapons see also above, p. 320, n. 213, and *Sin* is found (in combination with *Almu Allamu*), *CT*, XX, 23, obv. 11. If the 'club' *UT-DI-su-u* should turn out to be the same as *atmû kēnu*, we might restore the line according to *Rm* 106. See Jastrow, "Notes on Omen Texts" (*AJSL*, XXIII, p. 102).

²²² Cf. Brünnow, No. 216, and Muss-Arnolt, *Assyr. Dict.*, p. 744.

²²³ E. g., in the *Ninib* myth (Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. I, p. 464).

²²⁴ The most common equivalent of *KAK*=*epēšu* 'do' and its derivatives, 'strength, 'elevation,' etc. (Brünnow, No. 5254).

²²⁵ *PAL*=*na kâr u* 'hostile' and the like (Brünnow, No. 272).

²²⁶ *DI-DI*=*kaš ādu* 'conquer' (Brünnow, No. 9563).

su-u 'storm excessive in perfection'²²⁷—names that would all be appropriate as designations for the weapons of deities, and on a par with saḫmaštum 'uprising' and di-e-pu 'overthrow,' ūmu šaḫu 'mighty storm,' etc. The first line of the second tablet of the series preserved in the colophon continues the enumeration of various kinds of zibē, but the line also shows that in the second tablet a different plan was followed. We no longer have a setting forth of the principles underlying the system of hepatoscopy, but a continuous enumeration of signs noted with the interpretation directly attached. The colophon line reads as follows:

šumma zibu šu-šu-ru ša imitti marti, zibu šul-mu[ša šu-mēli marti zibu šarri(?) . . . ša-]niš²²⁸ zibu šalilu.

"If an 'overthrow' zibu is to the right of the gall-bladder and a 'perfection' zibu to the left of the gall-bladder, the club of the ruler will overthrow (?) (or) the club will be a protection."

Among the omens connected with the campaigns of Sargon,²²⁹ we find an almost parallel sign noted, a šušuru club to the right of the gall-bladder and a suḫuru 'inclosure' club to the left, and the interpretation involved is favorable, precisely as it is in our line. The colophon which has already been discussed²³⁰ offers nothing further of moment, except that as in the case of colophons attached to omen series and to rituals in which the consultation of the omen gods *par excellence*, Šamaš and Adad, the bēlê biri²³¹ 'lords of inspection' is involved, these two gods, instead of Nebo and Tašmit are invoked as the ones who inspired Ašurbanapal

²²⁷ Dr = šul mu (Brünnow, No. 9538), suggested also by CT, XX, 42, 33, where mention is made of a zibu dr(mu) = šul mu. But for this, seeing that dr-su-u is the name of the weapon of Šamaš the 'judge' among the gods, one might have thought of dr = dī nu 'judgment' (Brünnow, No. 9526). For the remaining name the "triple" zibu see above, p. 322, n. 217, and compare the "double" zibu in the omens attached to the *Stele der Inschrift Nabu'naiḏs* (ed. Messerschmidt), Col. XI, 11, probably intended as a description of Ninib's weapon. See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 263, n. 4, and for the names of various other weapons associated with Ninib which bear much the same character as the interpretations here proposed, see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. I, p. 461.

²²⁸ Literally "secondly" used interchangeably with u-lu to indicate an alternative interpretation. See, e. g., CT, XX, 50, rev. 3, and the passages in Jastrow, II, p. 253, n. 4, and p. 261, n. 9.

²²⁹ IV R. 2 34, rev. 3-4. Cf. Jastrow, II, p. 241, and the explanatory notes to the passage.

²³⁰ See above, p. 286. Note that the opening line of the second tablet does not agree with CT, XX, 16, pointing therefore to two "recensions" of the multa biltum series.


²³¹ See Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 249, n. 5.

with wisdom to collect the literary productions of the past in his palace.²³²

The investigation of this important school text has, I trust, shed some further light on the interesting methods followed by Babylonian pedagogues in initiating their pupils into the mysteries of hepatoscopy. Were it fully preserved it would probably have solved most, if not all, of the difficulties that still remain to be cleared up in the study of these texts. Let us hope that some fortunate chance has in store for us the finding of the original from which the scribes of Ašurbanapal prepared their copies, or if not the original, which, as in the case of all the omen texts of the royal library, probably dates back to the days of Hammurabi,²³³ a later copy prepared for the temple school at Babylon, or for one of the other schools attached to the temples in the south.

²³² For other passages see Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. II, p. 226, n. 1.

²³³ Indicated, e. g., by the frequent use of the sign *ša* (Brünnow, No. 11720) instead of *sa* (Brünnow, No. 3070) as the suffix of the third person feminine and which is characteristic of texts of the Hammurabi period. See also above, p. 320, n. 210. I owe this suggestion to Dr. Arno Poebel. The Assyrian copyists did not modernize their texts, but conscientiously followed the models before them. The absence of Marduk and the prominence given to Enlil in these omen texts of Ašurbanapal's library likewise point to their great antiquity, so that even the copies of Hammurabi's days would go back to a still earlier age, to a time when the chief god of Nippur was still at the head of the pantheon. We should expect, therefore, to find copies of omen texts like the one here investigated among the remains of the temple school at Nippur. If any such texts were found by Haynes at Nippur in 1900, it is not unreasonable to expect that after seven years' delay *some* specimens at least should be published; and it is perhaps not superfluous to emphasize that even literary texts, if they turn out to be school exercises or school copies, belong to a temple school and not to a hypothetical temple library. Progress in every science is marked by increasing and more clearly defined differentiations in the technical nomenclature. A failure to distinguish between "temple archives," "official reports," "temple school documents" and literary texts pure and simple, which alone, *if occurring in large numbers*, would justify us in assuming that they belong to a "temple library" falls necessarily at the present stage of Assyriological investigation under suspicion of being a strategic device to cover a retreat from an indefensible position. It is not a question of terms but of what we wish to convey when we use a certain term.



⚡=UR=
Kabittu (Liver)

◀◀◀=BA=Pântû (Liver surface)

(A) lobus sinister ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡
kappu kabitti ša šumêli

(B) lobus quadratus

(C) lobus dexter ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡
kappu kabitti ša imitti

(D) lobus caudatus ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = UR-MURUB
kabittukabittu

(D') processus papillaris ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ MAŠ = niru(?)

(D'') processus pyramidalis ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = šu-si ubânû

(E) vesica fellea ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = šu-martu

(F) ductus cysticus ⚡⚡⚡ = NA

(G) ductus hepaticus ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = GIR = nipra

(H) ductus choledochus ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ME-NI

(I) vena cava caudalis

(K) vena portae ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = KALAG = dannu

porta hepatis ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = GAR-TAB = naṣṣapṭû

(L) lympho glandulae ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = DI = šultnu

(M) fossa venae umbilicalis

MARKINGS

⚡⚡⚡ = giriku = zibu "club"

◀ = BURU = diḥu "hole"

⚡⚡⚡ = GIR = padanu "road"

⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ ⚡⚡⚡ = KAK-ZAG-GA = kaskasu = liver fluke (leberigel)

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE
PARABLES OF ENOCH

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE PARABLES OF ENOCH

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

Guillaume Postel, who in Rome was shown a copy of the Ethiopic *Book of Enoch* by an Abyssinian priest¹ and had its contents explained to him,² seems to have regarded it as a genuine work of the patriarch with interpolations from a *Book of Noah*.³ It was his opinion, based partly on the testimony of Josephus concerning the two inscribed stelae erected by Seth,⁴ partly on general considerations, that Enoch wrote this book in Hebrew.⁵ The same view appears to have been held by Gilbert Générard.⁶

Joseph Scaliger had no knowledge of the Ethiopic text, but he inferred from the character of the Greek fragments preserved in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus, which he published for the first time, that they were translated from the Hebrew. He deemed it necessary to apologize for introducing so tedious and indelicate a work on the ground that it was a translation from the Hebrew, possessed a high age, and had been quoted by Jude.⁷ Like Erasmus, Clarius, and Nicolas Zegers,⁸ he evidently looked upon it as an apocryphal writing. His statement, 'vetustissimus est liber' should be considered in the light of this estimate, and it is possible that 'ex hebraismo' should be interpreted as broadly as Jerome's 'ab hebraeo sermone' generally is.

¹ Contextum mihi a sacerdote Aethiope expositum,' *De Originibus*, 1553, II, p. 11, in Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* 2, 1722, II, p. 215; cf. Conrad Gesner, 'Enochi librum Guillelmus Postellus invenit,' *Appendix to Bibliotheca Universalis*, 1555, p. 32.

² See D. G. Morhof, 'ejusdem libri exemplum forte fuisse quis credat, quo usus est, sed alio interpretante, Postellus,' *Polyhistor* (1687),⁴ 1747, p. 46.

³ Ex libris Noachi et Henochi collecto,' *De Originibus*, loc. cit.

⁴ *Ant. Jud.* i, 70, ed. Niese.

⁵ 'Hebraica sanctave aut Foenix lingua . . . quae primo fuerit toti generi humano in usu,' *De Foenicum literis*, 1551, reprinted in Havercamp, *Sylloge Scriptorum*, II, 1740, pp. 706 f., 715.

⁶ *Chronographia*, 1580, I, p. 14.

⁷ *Animadversiones in Chronologiam Eusebii*, 1606, p. 245.

⁸ In *Critici Sacri*, VIII, 303 ff.

Drusius may, at one time, have thought of the Aramaic, as he explained 'Venit Dominus' in Jude's quotation: 'id sonat in lingua Syrorum, Maranatha, extremum genus excommunicationis apud Ebraeos, quod et Samatha dicitur quasi שמתא אהת'.⁹ But in emending 'cum sanctis millibus suis' into 'cum decem millibus sanctis suis,' he recurred to the Hebrew ברבבות קדשיו,¹⁰ rather than to the Aramaic ברבבות קדשוהי,¹¹ and in his last note he translated the whole passage into Hebrew.¹² Scaliger's view was accepted by Louis Cappel.¹³ Grotius, also,¹⁴ looked for a Hebrew or Aramaic original, as he ascribed the apocryphon to the Rabbis, mentioned its quotation in Zohar, and repeated the linguistic explanations of Drusius. Less important was the defense of a Hebrew original by Jean Boulduc,¹⁵ Joachim Mader,¹⁶ and William Whiston,¹⁷ who believed in the Enochian authorship.

On the other hand, J. H. Hottinger¹⁸ maintained that the book was written in Greek by a Hellenistic Jew. This would explain both Hebraisms and Greek paronomasias, like *Φαρμαρος* (for *Φαρμακος*, Fabricius) *εδιδαξεν Φαρμακειας*,¹⁹ as well as the ignorance of Hebrew names in the passage mentioning *Ναφηλειμ* and *Ελιουδ*.²⁰ He was followed by Heidegger,²¹ Morhof apparently,²² and Fabricius.²³ The arguments could not easily be met as long as the patristic quotations and the Syncellus fragments

⁹ *Henoch*, 1615, in *Critici Sacri*, I, 2, p. 383. On the phrase מרן אהת, misinterpreted by Drusius, and the imperative, אהת, cf. Schmidt, *JBL*, 1894, pp. 50 ff.; 1896, p. 44; on שמתא for שמדתא, cf. Buxtorf and Levy s. v.

¹⁰ In *Critici Sacri*, VIII, p. 312.

¹¹ The original Aramaic text in *Enoch* 1:9 probably read הַא אַהַת בְּרַבְבוֹת קְדִישִׁין, and was suggested by the author's Aramaic rendering of אֶת רַבְּנָת בָּא מְסִינִי יְהוָה and קְדִשׁ (so 6854) in Deut. 33: 2. He, of course, did not know any of the Aramaic, Greek, or Latin versions familiar to us.

¹² *Notae in Parallela Sacra*, p. 55 in *Critici Sacri*, VIII.

¹³ *Spicilegium*, 1629, pp. 136 f.

¹⁴ In *Critici Sacri*, VIII, 315, 317.

¹⁵ *Ecclesia ante legem*, 1630, I, c. 14.

¹⁶ *De scriptis et bibliothecis antediluvianis*, 1666, pp. 19 ff.

¹⁷ *A Collection of Authentick Records*, I, 1727, p. 288.

¹⁸ *De prophetia Henochi in Primitiae Heidelbergenses*, 1659, pp. 7 f.

¹⁹ 8:3. The Akhmim text reads *Αρμαρος* and omits *φαρμακειας*.

²⁰ 7:2. The Aramaic text probably read עֲלִירְתָּא, 'majestates,' on which the following word translated *μεγαλειστος* was a paronomasia. It is omitted in the recension exhibited by the Eth. and Akhmim texts.

²¹ *Historia patriarchurum*, 1671, pp. 267 ff.

²² *Polyhistor* 4, 1747, p. 46.

²³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 179, 185.

were the only sources; and they undoubtedly influenced not only Hermann Witsius,²⁴ who, following Cave and Dodwell, ascribed the work to some 'Hellenistic Cabbalist,' or Christian heretic of the second century, but also Richard Simon,²⁵ John Toland,²⁶ Jean Astruc, who declared 'j'avoue que les écrits attribuez aux anciens patriarches me paroissent supposez,'²⁷ and Johann Salomo Semler who held that 'die Beschreibungen in Briefe Judä und 2 Petri sind aus Apocryphis griechischer Juden.'²⁸

In 1769, the Ethiopic *Enoch* which until then had apparently been seen by only three Europeans, Pico della Mirandola, Guillaume Postel, and Gilles de Loches, was discovered in Abyssinia by James Bruce. In harmony with local tradition, he seems to have looked upon the book as a part of the Scriptures possessed by the Jews in Abyssinia before the introduction of Christianity and translated by them from the Hebrew.²⁹ He regarded it, in fact, as having been held in high authority even among the pagans,³⁰ and identified it with the Sabaeen book ascribed to Enoch,³¹ while distinguishing it from that quoted by Jude as well as from that possessed by the Rabbis.³² Nevertheless, he considered it a Gnostic work, and was so disgusted with it that he could at first read only a few chapters.³³ J. G. Eichhorn,³⁴ in commenting upon his account, suggested that Egyptian Jews may, in the time of the Ptolemies, have emigrated to Abyssinia,

²⁴ *Meletemata Leidenses*, 1703, pp. 501 ff.

²⁵ *Note sur Jude 14*, in Fabricius, *loc. cit.*, pp. 204 f.

²⁶ *Books ascribed to the Apostles, etc.*, in *A Collection of Several Pieces*, 1726, p. 383.

²⁷ *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse*, 1753, p. 287.

²⁸ *Anhang zu dem Versuch einer biblischen Dämonologie*, 1776, pp. 321, 330 f.

²⁹ *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile*, 1790, I, pp. 489 ff.

³⁰ *Loc. cit.*, p. 500.

³¹ The neo-Platonic philosophers of Harran, surrounded on all sides by Christians, may very well have been familiar with Enoch, and identified him with Hermes, long before they were obliged to seek toleration as monotheists and 'people of a book' under the shelter of the name 'Sabaeans,' by which Muhammad had meant the Mandaeans. Chwolson, *Die Ssabier*, 1856, I, 627 ff. exaggerates the wickedness of these pagan philosophers, leans too heavily upon his theory of craftiness and fraud, and underestimates the honest syncretism as well as the genuine theistic unitarianism of this movement.

³² *An Account of the Book of Enoch by James Bruce* in Laurence, *Libri Enoch Prophetæ Versio Ethiopica*, 1838, pp. x f.

³³ *Travels*, I, 499.

³⁴ *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, III, 1790, pp. 123 f.

and made a translation of the Alexandrian version into Geez. Ten years later, Sylvestre de Sacy³⁵ introduced some chapters of the book in a Latin translation. He was the first scholar clearly to express the opinion that it was originally written in Aramaic. In a review of Laurence's translation, he observed, 'je partage entièrement son opinion, pourvu qu'on prenne le nom de langue hébraïque ici avec quelque latitude; car il se pourrait que l'original eût été écrit en chaldéen, ou dans l'idiome que parloient les habitans de la Palestine au temps de J. C. et des apôtres, et qui ne nous est que bien imparfaitement connu.'³⁶ Laurence had, indeed, himself stated that the lost Greek copy was 'perhaps nothing more than a mere translation from some Hebrew or Chaldee original;'³⁷ but the alternative did not seem to the French orientalist to be strongly enough emphasized.

Even after the publication of the English version, the arguments of Hottinger appeared to Lücke³⁸ sufficient to warrant the assumption of a Greek original. Against this view, A. G. Hoffmann³⁹ urged the Hebrew names of the angels and the quotations in Zohar, and maintained that the Greek book was translated from Hebrew or Aramaic. It is the merit of Edward Murray⁴⁰ to have first presented the important reasons for a Semitic original found in the paronomasias of *Enoch* 77:1-3. This was subsequently recognized by Hoffmann, who added new arguments.⁴¹ Murray was forced by his untenable theories to think of Hebrew; some interpolations he ascribed to an Abyssinian author.⁴² Gfrörer⁴³ was not familiar with Murray's arguments when he sided with Lücke. Bruno Bauer,⁴⁴ who regarded the 'Son of

³⁵ *Magasin Encyclopédique*, VI, 1800, pp. 382 ff., reprinted by Laurence, *The Book of Enoch*, 1821, pp. 169-80.

³⁶ *Journal des Savans*, 1822, p. 548.

³⁷ *The Book of Enoch*, 1821, p. iv. In the introduction to the last edition of this work, 1883, pp. viii ff. the anonymous author of 'The Evolution of Christianity,' who had access to Laurence's latest notes, understands him to favor 'the theory of an Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaean origin,' and himself adds an argument drawn from the identity of names of angels in this book and those in Aramaic inscriptions on Babylonian terra-cotta bowls found by Layard.

³⁸ *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1832, pp. 52 ff.; 2d ed. 1852, pp. 110 ff.

³⁹ *Das Buch Henoch*, I, 1833, pp. 22, 30.

⁴⁰ *Enoch Restitutus*, 1836, pp. 43 ff.

⁴¹ *Loc. cit.*, II, 1838, pp. 929 f.

⁴² *Loc. cit.*, pp. 63 ff., 74.

⁴³ *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, 1838, I, pp. 95 f.

⁴⁴ *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, 1841, pp. 401 ff.

Man' passages and 90:37 f. as of Christian origin, probably assumed that they were written in Greek. This was distinctly affirmed by Friedrich Böttcher⁴⁵ in regard to the Christian interpolations, while he deemed the earlier text to have been translated from Hebrew. His suggestion that the name of the sun 𐤠𐤌𐤍 in 78:1 was in Aramaic ܡܠܟܝ should not have been overlooked by all exegetes. Less felicitous was his 𐤠𐤌𐤍 = aliquid for 𐤠𐤌𐤍 'word' in 90:38, where Aram. ܡܠܟܝ was transliterated *ρημα*.⁴⁶

August Dillmann decided that the original must have been either Hebrew or Aramaic.⁴⁷ He criticized Laurence for not possessing the necessary qualifications 'properly to translate and understand such a work translated from the Aramaic into the Greek and from the Greek into the Ethiopic.'⁴⁸ But even after the discovery of the Akhmim text, he did not absolutely commit himself beyond the statement that a 'Hebrew-Aramaic original' had been proved at least for chaps. 1-36.⁴⁹ Jellinek⁵⁰ maintained that the book was originally written in Hebrew; while Ewald⁵¹ held that it was a translation of an Aramaic or Hebrew original. The authority of these scholars did not, however, deter C. H. Weisse⁵² from considering the entire work as a Greek production; and even Köstlin⁵³ thought it possible that the *Parables* were written in Greek. Hilgenfeld⁵⁴ voted for Hebrew, Volkmar,⁵⁵ Michel Nicolas,⁵⁶ and Philippi⁵⁷ for Greek.

A decided step forward was taken when Joseph Halévy⁵⁸ presented his suggestive essay on the subject. But in spite of his arguments, Maurice Vernes⁵⁹ assumed an Aramaic origin for the groundwork, while he thought that the interpolations, to which

⁴⁵ *De inferis*, 1846, pp. 259, 261 f. He apparently also thought of possible Ethiopic interpolations, as he looked for a critical edition to help in settling 'quae mendosa, quae ex graecis hebraisve male reddita, quae alienis locis collocata,' p. 261.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*, p. 262.

⁴⁷ *Das Buch Henoch*, 1853, pp. li ff.

⁴⁸ *Loc. cit.*, p. lviii.

⁴⁹ *Sitzungsberichte d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch.*, 1892, p. 16.

⁵⁰ *ZDMG*, 1853, p. 249.

⁵¹ *Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensetzung*, 1854, p. 8.

⁵² *Die Evangelienfrage*, 1856, p. 223.

⁵³ *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1856, p. 376.

⁵⁴ *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857, p. 95.

⁵⁵ *ZDMG*, 1860, pp. 131 f.

⁵⁶ *Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs*, 1860, pp. 262 ff.

⁵⁷ *Das Buch Henoch*, 1868, pp. 124 ff.

⁵⁸ *Journal Asiatique*, 1867, pp. 352 ff.

⁵⁹ *Histoire des idées messianiques*, 1874, p. 72.

he reckoned the *Parables* and about half of the work, were written in Greek.⁶⁰ Subsequently he abandoned the latter theory, and left the question open between Hebrew or Aramaic.⁶¹ Hausrath⁶² followed Dillmann, as did also Schodde.⁶³ Eugène de Faye⁶⁴ regarded the *Parables* as the work of a Hellenistic Jew with Christian interpolations, and consequently as written in Greek. Hebrew was favored by Lazarus Goldschmidt,⁶⁵ who translated Dillmann's version into this language, with sometimes very valuable notes. In editing the Akhmim text, Adolphe Lods⁶⁶ discussed the original language, but was not able to decide between Hebrew and Aramaic; and Dieterich⁶⁷ still inclined to the Greek. Charles, however, strongly held that the author wrote in Hebrew, and often repeated this view.⁶⁸ It is a significant fact that this scholar, to whom students of Enoch are so deeply indebted, has recently reached the conclusion that chaps. 6-36 and probably 72-82 were written in Aramaic, while 37-71, 83-104, and probably 1-5 were written in Hebrew.⁶⁹

Arguments in favor of an Aramaic original were drawn by Schürer⁷⁰ from the presence in the Akhmim text of such words as *φουκα* = פּוּכָא (18:8), *Μανδοβαρα* (28:1) and *Βαβδηρα* (29:1), corrupt for *Μαδβαρα* = מַדְבָּרָא. Israel Lévi⁷¹ pointed out that any Jew would know the meaning of Hebrew words like Jared and Hermon, while only one speaking Aramaic would write מַדְבָּרָא, פּוּכָא, and אֶרְמֹנָא. B. D. Eerdmans⁷² added to these חֶלְבוֹנָא (31:1) חֶרְמוֹן (6:6), which would be preferable to Heb. הַחֲרִיבוֹן, and בְּרִנְשָׁא in the 'Son of Man' passages; and he was fortified in his position by De Goeje,⁷³ who called attention to the

⁶⁰ Oscar Gebhardt also expressed a certain scepticism as to "einen etwaigen hebräischen Urtext," Merx's *Archiv f. wiss. Erforschung d. A. T.*, II, 1872, p. 241.

⁶¹ In Lichtenberger's *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 1877, I, 409, and *La grande encyclopédie*, art. "Apocalypses juives."

⁶² *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*³, I, p. 185. ⁶³ *The Book of Enoch*, 1882, pp. 43 f., 59 f.

⁶⁴ *Les apocalypses juives*, 1892, pp. 205 ff. ⁶⁵ *Das Buch Henoch*, 1892, pp. xiii f.

⁶⁶ *Le livre d'Enoch: Fragments grecs*, 1892, pp. lvi ff. ⁶⁷ *Nekyia*, 1893, p. 216.

⁶⁸ *The Book of Enoch*, 1893, p. 21; *Encyclopedia Biblica*, 1899, I, cols. 220 f.; *DB*, 1902, I, pp. 705 f.

⁶⁹ *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 1906, pp. x, xxvii ff.

⁷⁰ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1893, col. 75; *Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes*³, 1898, III, 203.

⁷¹ *Revue des études juives*, 1893, p. 149.

⁷² *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1895, pp. 51 ff.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

term **בַּר** (*Barous* 10:19) in our oldest Aramaic inscription. In a paper presented to the Society for Biblical Literature in 1895, I expressed my conviction that the original was written in Aramaic.⁷⁴ Hans Lietzmann⁷⁵ reached the same conclusion. Wellhausen⁷⁶ quoted the plural *χερουβιν* (14:11, 18) and several cases of the *status emphaticus* in favor of an Aramaic original. Theodor Zahn⁷⁷ expressed his belief that Jude quoted, not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew or Aramaic *Enoch*. G. Beer⁷⁸ thought of Hebrew or Aramaic, with an evident leaning toward the latter, strengthened by Prätorius,⁷⁹ whose judgment is indicated by his suggestion that the Greek translator read **רַבִּינָא** for **רַבִּינָא** in 29:1. Paul Fiebig⁸⁰ and J. Van Loon⁸¹ declared for the Aramaic. But Johannes Flemming⁸² was not ready to decide between Hebrew and Aramaic. Enno Littmann⁸³ favored the former, and François Martin,⁸⁴ on the whole, thought Hebrew more probable. Finally, F. C. Burkitt⁸⁵ drew from the analogy of **מַלְאָכִים** and **מַלְאָכִים** inferences that seem to indicate that he regarded the author of the *Parables* as having written in Aramaic.

The view that the *Parables of Enoch* were originally written in Greek, held by Hottinger, Heidegger, Fabricius, Semler, Lücke, Gfrörer, Böttcher, Weisse, Köstlin, Volkmar, Nicolas, Philippi, Vernes, De Faye, and Dieterich, is not likely to be seriously defended again. Every competent scholar today recognizes that they must originally have been written in a Semitic language, and that none other than Hebrew or Aramaic can be considered, as was seen by Scaliger, Drusius, Grotius, Laurence,

⁷⁴ "Was **בַּרְנַשָּׁא** a Messianic title?" *JBL*, 1896, p. 47; *Encyclopedia Biblica*, IV, 1903, col. 4710; *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905, p. 117.

⁷⁵ *Der Menschensohn*, 1896, p. 45.

⁷⁶ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899, p. 241.

⁷⁷ *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, II, 1899, pp. 105 f.

⁷⁸ *Das Buch Henoch* in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, 1900, pp. 217 f., 235; Guthe's *Bibelwörterbuch*, 1903, p. 253. In Hauck's *Prot. Realencyklopädie*, 1905, VI, 239, he suggested the possibility of some parts having been written in Hebrew, others in Aramaic.

⁷⁹ Quoted by Beer, *Das Buch Henoch*, p. 256.

⁸⁰ *Der Menschensohn*, 1901, p. 86.

⁸¹ *Th. Tijdschrift*, 1902, p. 441.

⁸² *Das Buch Henoch*, 1901, pp. 1, 33, 59, 87, 121, 133.

⁸³ *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, V, 180.

⁸⁴ *Le livre d'Enoch*, 1906, p. lvii.

⁸⁵ *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1907, p. 447.

Hoffmann, Dillmann, Ewald, Hausrath, Schodde, Lods, Beer, and Flemming. But is it possible to go farther and to affirm that the author or authors wrote in Hebrew, as especially Whiston, Murray, Jellinek, Hilgenfeld, Halévy, Goldschmidt, Charles, Littmann, and Martin have done? Or can it be maintained that these chapters were written in Aramaic, as De Sacy, Schürer, Lévi, Eerdmans, De Goeje, Schmidt, Lietzmann, Wellhausen, Prætorius, Fiebig, Van Loon, and Burkitt seem to have done? The answer must depend upon the possibility of explaining by the Aramaic those peculiarities for which hitherto recourse was had to the Hebrew, and of discovering new indications of one language or the other behind the Ethiopic text.

Halévy⁸⁶ cited three instances from the *Parables* themselves (40:9; 51:3; and 62:16) and a large number from the interpolations (41:5, 44; 60:6, 14, 15; 65:8, 10*a*, *b*, 11; 67:13; 68:2, 3; and 69:1, 6, 8, 13), in which he deemed it necessary to assume a Hebrew original; Charles⁸⁷ called attention to five from the *Parables* (40:9; 45:3; 46:4*b*; 52:9; and 56:7) and five from the interpolations (65:10*a*, *b*, 11; 67:13; and 69:13), which seemed to him conclusively to point in the same direction.

To begin with the *Parables*, both of these scholars regarded the statement concerning Raphael (40:9) as containing a reference to the derivation of the name Raphael which is possible only in Hebrew—רפא='to heal.'⁸⁸ But Nöldeke declares that 'רפא ist gemeinsemitisch' and refers to *Ephr. Syr.* II, 447 C, and the Palmyrene names רפאכול and בורפא for the Aramaic.⁸⁹ In 45:3 we should read: 'and he will try their works;' the Aramaic was probably יבחרי. There is no reason to regard 46:5a as a dittograph of 46:4b. If the text has suffered expansion, it is more natural to suppose that אלוהים : אלילי : מאלוללי : אמורי הנהלתם : מלכיהני : למסכתתם : is a reminiscence of Luke 1:52, משיחתי : מלכותי : למסכתתם . In 51:3 Halévy's instinct led him rightly to Micah 7:5. But פתחי פי does not solve the riddle. For פתחים has no such meaning as 'thought' or

⁸⁶ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 364 ff.

⁸⁷ *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 1906, pp. xxx ff.

⁸⁸ Halévy, *loc. cit.*, p. 364; Charles, *loc. cit.*, p. xxx. ⁸⁹ *ZDMG*, XL, 1886, 723.

'intellect' in Hebrew. The author probably wrote מְלִילוֹת פִּימֶה = 'the eloquence of his mouth.'⁹⁰ But מְלִילוֹת has the sense of 'rationality' as well as 'eloquence;' and the translator gave the Ethiopic equivalent for the latter, ሕሳብ, thus introducing 'the thoughts of his mouth' which have caused so much trouble.

A similar mistake was made by the translator in 52:9 where he rendered יִתְרַצֵּן by ይኸከሉ 'will be denied,' not observing that ገጽ also means 'destroy' and should have been so translated here.⁹¹ In 56:7 an excellent text is secured by itacising ለምት, not found in *g*, and accepting the negative of ጥ (አይከውን). The ልብስክሙ of the older group of MSS has removed the occasion for Halévy's speculations in 62:16.

None of these passages shows that the *Parables* were written in Hebrew. In fact, the difficulties for which Halévy and Charles have resorted to Hebrew can in some instances be met only on the theory that the work was written in Aramaic.

As the *Apocalypse of Noah* seems to have been translated from the Greek, and parts of it were probably interpolated in the *Parables* by the Ethiopic editor, there is, indeed, no necessity *a priori* for supposing that it was originally written in the same language as the Enoch books. But a consideration of the passages quoted from the interpolations points even here to the Aramaic. It is not certain that 41:3-8; 44, belonged to the *Apocalypse of Noah*, but the secondary character is unmistakable, and the ultimate source of these verses may quite probably have been the apocalyptic writing quoted elsewhere in the *Parables*. According to Halévy's conjecture, ለመሐል: ዘነሐ in 41:5 goes back to בשבוע שעמדו בה which in the dialect of the Mishna signifies 'to be bound by an oath.' If this is so, an Aramaic speaking Jew may have known and used the phrase, and ܐܕܠ: might be due to a confusion of עמד and עמר, 'to dwell.' Unfortunately, Halévy quotes no instance of this usage. Charles thinks of שכנו being mistaken for נשבעו. This would be possible also in Aramaic; but the mistake is not very probable. Radermacher suggests a corruption of ὠρκισθησαν into ὠκισθησαν,

⁹⁰ In Micah 7:5 Pesh. and Trg. both have מְלִי פִּימֶה.

⁹¹ The root רמא has the meaning of 'deny' in Afel, and probably also in Ittafel.

but this would not explain the Ethiopic text. The text accepted by Flemming and Charles seems to be a compromise of two variants **אני : חזק :** and **אסחא : חזק :** The former may represent **באתר דעמרו** 'wherever their position may be,' the latter is probably a gloss suggested by **במונא ,הימנותא יזשטש** 'because of the oath by which they were united.' In 44 the partitive **מן** is as natural in Aramaic as in Hebrew. In 60:6 the MS *u* has the negative which was missed; hence there is no reason for thinking of a confusion of **עבר** with **עבר**. In 60:14 the Aramaic **סדרא** would give the same sense as the Hebrew **סדר**; but the idea of 'pauses' (Aram. **פשוותא**) in the thunder is quite as plausible as 'arrangements' of the thunder; and this applies also to 60:15. In 65:8, there is no objection to the text **שגחא** = 'is pre-eminent.' Charles conjectures that **שגחא** in 65:10a goes back to a misreading of **יחשך** for **יחשב**. It is far more probable that the Aramaic **יחמנע** 'will be withheld' was mistaken for **יחמנא** 'will be counted.'

Halévy suggested that in 65:10b **ל-ז-ח**, 'months,' is a translation of **הרשים**, corrupted from **הרשים**, 'sorceries,' and Charles thinks that this alone 'restores sanity to the text.' In itself, it would not be impossible that the text read **כל קבל דהרשיא**, which became corrupted into, or was mistaken for, **הרשיא**, a word sometimes used by Aramaic-speaking Jews (Pal. *Tamith* iii, 69a) instead of the regular **ירחא**. But would this really give an acceptable sense? Charles translates: "because of the sorceries which they have searched out, and through which they know that the earth and those who dwell upon it will be destroyed." It certainly is a strange idea that the terrible judgment of the flood would come because men had succeeded in discovering that the earth with its inhabitants would be destroyed. Scarcely less peculiar in this book would be the notion that men had themselves searched out such sorceries, and that they would use them to find out that they were to be severely punished. It seems to me probable that the Aramaic text read: **כל קבל דחמסחון יתעבר** **דינחון ולא יחמנע מן קדמי** **בדיל דירחא עד די אנון יבעון וידעון** **אין תחאבר ארעא ויתבין בה** "because of their violence their judgment will be carried out, and will not be withheld by me, on

account of the months during which they will inquire and learn how the earth and its inhabitants are to be destroyed." The 'months' may refer to the short period in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, when men learned through him how the earth was to perish, and enhanced their guilt by not repenting 'while the longsuffering of God waited.'⁹²

To this interpretation it may be objected that the episode, in order to fall within the earthly life of Enoch, cannot have been thought of as occurring later than the one hundred and fortieth year of Noah's life (Charles). But why cannot this consultation have taken place after Enoch's translation? Before that event, there was no necessity of going to 'the ends of the earth' to consult him. As Martin⁹³ has pointed out, Gilgamesh also goes to the ends of the earth to visit Ut Napishtim. That is where paradise was. Noah has to cry three times for Enoch. Then an earthquake occurs, a voice is heard from heaven, and Enoch appears, asking why he has been called in this manner. Chapter 60 is dated in the five hundredth year of Noah (Enoch is corrupt for Noah). It is noticeable that there is no revelation at that time in regard to the flood. He hears that a judgment is coming, and learns some secrets concerning Leviathan, Behemoth, the winds and the thunder, but nothing about a deluge. Chapter 65 is consequently later. Now he hears of the angels coming to let loose the waters. This communication apparently came not long before the catastrophe. It is in harmony with this that the disclosures to Noah in Gen., chaps. 6 and 7, seem to be made in the six hundredth year of his life.

In 65:11 the translator rendered תשובה by שׁוּבָא, 'return,' instead of by תְּשׁוּבָה, 'repentance,' the Aramaic word having both meanings. Since שׁוּבָא means both 'prince' and 'angel,' there is no need, as Flemming has pointed out,⁹⁴ of supposing a confusion of Heb. מַלְאָכִים and מְלָכִים, or Aram. מְלָאכִין and מְלָכִין, in 67:13. Halévy's suggestion of a חֵן דִּיר meaning 'punishment' and misunderstood 'inspiration,' in 68:2 is not convincing. In Gnostic thought, each spirit had its δύναμις (the Christ on the

⁹² I Pet. 3:20.

⁹³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 138.

⁹⁴ *Das Buch Henoch*, 1901, p. 86.

cross cries ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις μου, κατέλειψάς με, *Ev. Petri*, 19); the original חֵיל דְרוּחָא (ἡ δύναμις τοῦ πνεύματος) refers to this 'power.' Instead of 'irritates me,' אַרְגִּיזֵנִי should have been rendered 'causes me to tremble.' The three words before the second אַחֲזֵי should be omitted with *a*; and we should read with *b*² ወእ.ደ.ገ.መሰረ. The original of the latter phrase was probably וְלֹא יִשְׁתְּרָא 'without being destroyed,' שְׂרָא meaning 'destructus est' in Ethpael, and 'liquefactus est' in Ethpeel.

A large number of MSS give the text in 68:3 'whose heart is not touched with pity?' (דְּמִן לֹא יַחְרֹחֵם לְבָה) which is in harmony with the following 'and whose reins are not moved?' (וּדְמִן לֹא יַחְדָּלוּן כְּלִינוּהִי). The author seems to have had in mind Ps. 73:21. The older group of MSS, however, reads ዘእ.ደ.ረሰሐ, 'whose heart does not condemn him?' This phrase is clearly a reminiscence of I John 3:20, 'if our heart condemns us,' where the Ethiopic version uses the same term ደርሰሐረሰ: ልሰ. This should serve as a warning against too much confidence in one group of our very young MSS. The end of the verse may have read: מִן הָרִין פִּתְגָמָא דְנִפְקַע עֲלֵיהוֹן דְּמִפִּיקִין כְּמִין וְהָא 'on account of this sentence that has gone forth upon those who have brought forth such things.' The word פִּתְגָמָא may at first have been translated ቃል, while ዘእ.ደ. was later added to define the meaning; מִפִּיקִין may have intentionally carried the suggestion of מְזִנִּיא, 'fornicadores.' In 69:1 יַאֲרִיזוּהוֹן was by a mistake translated 'he will exasperate them,' instead of 'he will cause them to tremble.' Halévy supposes the original of Gadreel in 69:6 to have been עֲדֵרִיאַל, and in this he is probably right. In support of the meaning 'to fight' for the verb עָדַר, he appeals to I Chron. 12:33, 38. But the text is doubtful in both places; some Hebrew MSS have לָעֹזַר in the former and עֲרָכִי in the latter (Kennicott). The Aramaic עָדַר means 'to help,' probably also in *Genza*, left, p. 21, l. 21 (ed. Petermann), where אַחְזַהְרִלָּה no doubt represents אַחְזַהְרִלָּה. If it ever had the shade of meaning of the Arabic غَدَر, 'to become a traitor,' a name signifying 'God's helper' that also conveyed the suggestion of 'God's traitor' would be very suitable. Penemue(1) in 69:8 is, no doubt, from the same root as פְּנִימִי, but 'the interior of God' is not a

probable name. Panamu occurs as a name among the Aramaic-speaking kings of Zenjirli.

Halévy assumes that the original text in 69:13 had פְּקִידָה, which he thinks the translator took in the sense of 'number,' as in I Chron. 23:11, while he ought to have understood it to mean 'function, charge,' as in Num. 4:16. But פְּקִידָה in I Chron. 23:11 means 'class,' not 'number,' and there seems to be no other passage where it has this significance. It is not impossible that the Greek translator of the Noah apocalypse misunderstood אַמְנָא, 'negotium,' as though it came from בִּנְיָא, 'to count,' or mistook עִינָא for בִּינָא. But the whole context has manifestly suffered in transmission. I would suggest that the Ethiopic originally read: **ወላድስ : ስሙ : ተባዕተ : ዝነቐ : ውእቱ : ጎልቆ : በለቤ : ሳብዕ : ርእሰ : ማሐለ : ወስሙ : ሐቃኤ (ል)**, and was a rendering of **וּשְׁתִּיחִיָּא שׁוּמָה טַבְעַת הַדִּין הוּא רַב בְּרׁוּבָא שְׁבִיעִיא רִישׁ דְּשְׁבוּעָתָא דְּפִרְשָׁה לְקַדִּישִׁיא כְּד עֲמִר הוּא בְּמִרְיֻבָּא שְׁבִיחָא וְשׁוּמָה** (ל) **הָקָא** 'and the sixth, his name was Tēba'at: this one became a rebel in the tumult; and the seventh was the administrator of the oath which he revealed to the angels while he dwelt in heavenly glory, and his name was Ḥaḳael.' The 'son of the serpent' may be due to a reader who missed, in the catalogue of terms borrowed from Ps. 91, the companion of the serpent in vs. 6, **בֶּר אֲרִיא** (Trg. **בֶּר אֲרִיִּין**); **אֲרִיא** may have become **אֲרוּא**; **אַחַד** is not found in *q*; **ወላድስ** may have been misread **ወልደዝ**; **רב**, like **ጎልቆ**, means 'to rebel,' **רובא**, like **ልቤ**, 'tumult;' **ሳብዕ** may have become corrupted into **ሳብፌል**; **ሪሽ דְּשְׁבוּעָתָא** means 'keeper, administrator of the oath,' as **ሪሽ ለተራ** means 'toparch,' **ሪሽ ደִיר** 'abbot;' **שְׁבוּעָתָא** may have been an intentional paronomasia on **שְׁבִיעִיא**. The description, drawn indirectly from the *Book of Enoch* by Leon of Modena, that is quoted by Goldschmidt,⁹⁵ is not so strange when 'the son of the serpent' has been removed. Halévy rightly maintains that **ለቆ** and **አከአ** go back to **לְקַל**, and that this is the name of an angel, and not of an oath.

There are many indications of an Aramaic original beside the instances to which attention has been called where the difficulties

⁹⁵ *Das Buch Henoch*, 1892, p. 85.

are better explained by Aramaic than by Hebrew. The plurals Kiruben, Surafen, and Ophanin (61:10; 71:7), certainly represent the Aramaic **כרובין**, **שרפין** and **עופנין**. The anticipatory pronominal suffix, which Charles⁹⁶ rightly regards as showing dependence on the Aramaic in 9:8 and 19:2, is used very frequently in the *Parables*, and the prolepsis of object or adverbial clauses before the predicate occurs more often than in books originally written in Hebrew.

Of considerable importance is the peculiar use of **አቅድመ** or **አምቅድመ**. While in many passages it is employed like the Hebrew **לפני** or **מלפני**, there are not a few instances in which the Aramaic **מן קדם** furnishes a closer analogy. In 37:4 the text probably read: **עד כאן לא אתיהבת מן קדם מרא דרוחא**, 'until now there has not been given by the Lord of Spirits wisdom such as this that I am receiving;' in 37:8, **כן אתהרוק עלי מן קדם מרא דרוחא**, 'thus it was determined concerning me by the Lord of Spirits;' in 47:4, **דם, דצדיקיא יתנקם מן קדם מרא דרוחא**, 'the blood of the righteous will be avenged by the Lord of Spirits;' in 48:2, **בשעתא הוּא, שומיה אתקרא מן קדם מרא דרוחא**, 'in that hour his name was called by the Lord of Spirits,' and similarly in 48:3; and in 48:6, **על כן אתחבר ואטמן מן קדם מרא דרוחא**, 'therefore he was chosen and hidden by the Lord of Spirits.'

The verb **כפר**, which seems to have been used by the author, has been uniformly rendered 'deny' in the Ethiopic. But it also means 'scorn, despise, reject,' and one or another of these words should have been used at least in 45:1; 47:7; and 48:10. There is not the slightest evidence that the kings of the earth and the mighty lords who despise the name of the community of saints (45:1), believe in gods made with hands (46:7), persecute the believers (46:8), and scorn and reject the Lord of Spirits, are apostate Jews who have renounced the faith they once professed. In 46:7 **דעבדונון באידהון** should have been rendered 'which are made with hands;' cf. the active for the passive construction in Ezra 4:15; Dan. 7:13, and elsewhere. The statement, 'whose work depends upon the Lord of Spirits,' in 38:2, is not clear.

⁹⁶ *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 1903, p. xxviii.

Probably the text read: **וכן תתחזא צדקתא לאפי דצדיקא בחיריא** **דעבודתהון נקש במרא דרוחא**. This should have been translated: 'and when mercy shall be shown to those who have proved themselves righteous, whose worship has been rendered solely to the Lord of Spirits;' since **בחיר** means 'proved, tested' as well as 'elect;' **עבודתהון** 'their work' may have been a wrong vowel-ing for **עבודתהון** 'their worship' (cf. **עבודה זרה**), and **נקש** means 'be attached to, adhere to, be reserved for,' as well as 'depend upon.'

The title **מרא דרוחא** only occurs elsewhere in II Macc. 3: 24: **τῶν πνευμάτων κύριος** (Syr. **ܡܪܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ**); but it is really an interpretation of **יהוה צבאות**, as 39: 12 shows. It is more likely that such a translation should have been made in an Aramaic than in a Hebrew work in which the name **יהוה צבאות** would have been left unchanged. The free rendering 'he fills the earth with spirits' may be due to the Ethiopic translator who was influenced by the word **ፊደላት** in the Ethiopic version of Isa. 6: 3 (cf. *Enoch* 14: 23 **οἱ ἄγγελοι**). The divine name **ܥܠܐ : ܡܦܪܕܐ** is probably a rendering of **ריש יומיא**, the natural meaning of which would be 'Lord of Days.' While it is not a translation of **עתיק יומיא** in Dan. 7: 9, for that is **ܥܬܝܩ : ܡܦܪܕܐ**, it must have been inspired by the title in Daniel, as the allusion to the 'hair white as wool' and the 'son of man' shows. The author, no doubt, was familiar with the name **ריש יומיא**, and preferred to designate God as the ruler of our days and of all time rather than as an old man. Against this view it may be urged that, according to 46: 1 an 'old head' is meant, and that consequently, in 46: 2, the one like a man goes with 'the Old Head,' and, in 47: 3 'the Old Head' sits down on a throne. But the present text in 46: 1 is certainly corrupt. It cannot have read originally: 'there I saw . . . to whom a head of days belonged,' but, in all probability: **תמן הוא** 'there I saw and behold! the Lord of Days.' When the title is rightly understood, there is no inappropriateness in its use either in the Noah Apocalypse or the appendix.

The names of the angels apparently refer to their condition and functions before the fall. The great majority of them are Aramaic. Thus, (1) Semyaza = **ܫܡܝܐ ܕܗܘܐ**, 'he sees the Name,

i. e., God,' or שמיא הוא, 'he surveys the heavens,' as he reveals 'the revolution of the world' (8:1); (2) Arakib = ארכב, 'he causes to ride,' 'the charioteer'; (3) Araḳiel = ארקאל, 'God's earth,' or הרקאל, 'God determines'; (4) Kokabiel = כוכבאל, 'God's star'; (5) Terael = טראאל, 'God gives,' or תרעאל, 'God's gate'; (6) Ramiel = רמאל, 'God is exalted'; (7) Daniel = דניאל, 'God's judge,' or 'God is judge'; (8) Hasakiel = השקאל, 'God's sky'; (9) Barakiel = ברקאל, 'God's lightning'; (10) Azael or Azazel = עזאל or עזזאל, 'God is strong'; (11) Armaros = חרם, 'he consecrates a mystery,' or 'he keeps a secret under ban'; (12) Batariel = בתראל, 'the hinder part of God'; (13) Samiel = סמיאל (Sammael), 'the invisible things of God'; (14) Hano-niel = הננאל, 'God is gracious'; (15) Rekael = רכאאל, 'God is king'; (16) Sampsiel = שמשאל, 'God's sun'; (17) Satarel = סטראל, 'God's side,' or Yetarel = יתראל, 'God excels'; (18) Tumael = תומאאל, 'God's perfection'; (19) Turiel = טוראל, 'God's mountain'; (20) Sariel = סהראל, 'God's moon.' Ara-kiel, Ramiel, Samiel, and Azael occur as names of angels in *Oracula Sibyllina*, ii, 215. On Sammael cf. Buxtorf, *Lexicon s. v.* Tera' = 'gate,' Utra = 'abundance, excellence,' and Tura = 'mountain,' are found in the *Genza* of the Mandaeans as names of demons.

While in 8:1 ff. seven of these angels, viz., Azazel, Semyaza, Armaros, Barakiel, Kokabiel, Tamiel and Sariel, are selected for special mention, the leaders in 69:4 ff. are not in the larger group. They are: (1) Yeḳon = יקון, εικων 'image' (?); (2) Asebel = השבאל, 'the thought of God,' or 'God gives heed'; (3) Gadreel = עדראל, 'the helper of God'; (4) Penemue(1) = פנמואל, 'face of God' (?); (5) Kasdeya = כשטא, 'the archer,' 'sagittarius'; (6) Teba'at = טבעת, 'the circle,' the upper side of the Raḳia'; (7) Ḥaḳael = 'the law of God.' Yeḳon seduced the angels to reproduce their image and likeness. Ḥasbiel gave them evil counsel instead of strengthening them by good thoughts. Gadriel, or Adriel, who should have helped God, became a traitor teaching bloody warfare. Kasdeya, or Keshata, sent the arrows whose demonic effect Aramaic-speaking interpreters have suggested in the Targum to Ps. 91:6. Teba'at failed at his post

when the angels descended. Ḥaḥael, ambitious for the power of the ineffable name, broke the order of nature himself, and was obliged to surrender to Michael the administration of the oath. When Yekon and Asbiel are said to lead astray 'all the children of the holy angels,'⁹⁷ this is a false translation of **כלהון בני אלהין קרישינ**. As **בר אלהין** is 'an angel' (Dan. 3:25), **בני אלהין** are 'angels,' and the phrase should have been rendered 'all the holy angels.' The Greek translator of the Noah Apocalypse may be responsible for this error by rendering **אלהין**, *τῶν ἀγγέλων*, instead of *τοῦ θεοῦ*.

The most convincing evidence, however, of an Aramaic original is furnished by the Ethiopic translations of the term 'Son of Man.' They are: **ወልደ ሰብአ**: 46:2, 3, 4; 48:2; 60:10; **ወልደ ብእሲ**: 62:5 (some MSS have **ወልደ ብእሲት**); 69:29a, 29b (some MSS have **ወልደ ብእሲት**); 71:14, and **ወልደ እግለ እመሕያው**: 62:7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27; 70:1; 71:17. Of these the last is the most peculiar. Literally, it means 'the son of the offspring of the mother of the living.' It is possible that **እመ ሕያው**: was the title of some mother-goddess worshiped by the Geez people before their conversion to Christianity. One might think of Ta-urt 'the great one' who came to Egypt from Ethiopia and found her way back there again,⁹⁸ or the otherwise unknown moon-goddess whom, according to Plutarch,⁹⁹ the Egyptians called *μήτηρ τοῦ κόσμου*. But it remains most probable that Eve is meant, cf. Gen. 3:20. The meaning of **እጉል**: is 'embryo, foetus,' from the Semitic root **לגל**, 'to roll, to wind in a circle;' and **እግለ እመሕያው**: is used both as a collective and of the individual, and is a rendering of *οἱ ἀνθρώποι, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, and especially of *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* (Num. 23:19; Ps. 8:5; Job 16:21; Jer. 30:11).

It is a curious fact that when our Ethiopic translation of the New Testament was made, the ordinary method of rendering a noun definite by a prefixed **ውእቱ**: or **ዝንቱ**: or **ዝኩ**: was not followed. Instead of **ውእቱ እግለ እመሕያው**: which we would

⁹⁷ *Enoch* 69:4, 5.

⁹⁸ Cf. A. Wiedemann, *Die Religion der alten Ägypter*, 1890, pp. 88 f.

⁹⁹ *De Iside et Osiride*, c. 43, p. 76, l. 4, ed. Parthey.

have a right to expect, we find uniformly **ወልደ : እዓለ : እመሕያው :** and nowhere preceded by a demonstrative, as a rendering of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. There is only one natural explanation: the translation was made under the influence of the Aramaic **בריה דבר נשא** which also means literally 'the son of the son of man.' In other words, it was made by Aramaic-speaking Christians, not before the sixth century. For **בריה דבר נשא** occurs only in the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* and occasionally, as a reminiscence, in the Old Testament version made by Paul of Tella (618 A. D.). As in the case of this latter work, so in the Ethiopic version, the New Testament title occasionally crowded out the simpler **ወልደ : ሰብእ :** as in Dan. 7:13; Ezra 2:1 *al.* Enoch 60:10 suggests that this process had not set in yet when the *Parables* were translated.

If the term **ወልደ : እዓለ : እመሕያው :** were uniformly used for 'son of man' in the *Parables*, it would be natural to suppose that the translator had before him the title *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and therefore employed the familiar New Testament title. This, however, is far from being the case. Before chap. 62 he uses no other term than **ወልደ : ሰብእ :**, the equivalent of the Aramaic **בר נשא**. Later he employs four times the phrase **ወልደ : ሰብእ :** which corresponds to the Aramaic, **בריה דגברא**, as Burkitt¹⁰⁰ recognizes. This title maintained itself long, in spite of its suggestion of a human paternity, and is found in the Palestinian Lectionary, the Curetonian fragments, and the Sinaitic text. It is scarcely conceivable that a translator having before him a Greek text in which the New Testament title *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* was uniformly used should have employed three distinct Ethiopic expressions, and these of such a nature as to correspond exactly to three different Aramaic terms. The conclusion seems inevitable that he translated directly from the Aramaic. Whether he found in his text **בריה דבר נשא** as often as would appear from his version, must be left undecided; in 70:1 it is clearly an interpolation, and 71:18 is a late addition. If the Aramaic text contained such phrases as **בריה דגברא** and **בריה דבר נשא**, it must have passed through Christian hands, and it is greatly to their credit that, in half a

¹⁰⁰ *Loc. cit.*, p. 447.

thousand years, they did not tamper with it more seriously than the keenest criticism has seen reason to suppose.

A study of the linguistic peculiarities leads to the conviction that this work was translated from Aramaic into Ethiopic. General considerations strengthen this conclusion. If the *Parables of Enoch* were translated from a Greek text, one would certainly expect to find somewhere a quotation from it, or reference to it, in early Christian literature. Books of Enoch are quoted, with indication of the source, in the *Epistle of Jude* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*, by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Anatolius of Laodicea, in *Pistis Sophia* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, by Jerome, Augustine, Nicephorus, and Georgius Syncellus. Beside these, a very large number of Christian writers in all parts of the church manifestly drew upon the Enoch books without mentioning the reputed author. But nowhere in ecclesiastical literature is there the slightest trace of acquaintance with this work on the part of apostolic fathers, heretics, or Catholic teachers, from New Testament times to the discovery of the Ethiopic translation.

Yet it is difficult to believe that men who reverently cited the *Book of Enoch* as 'Scripture,' or who eagerly sought in its revelations information concerning the angels, should have found nothing worthy even of passing notice in these remarkable *Parables*. Could it have been of no interest to them that the translated Enoch had himself seen the pre-existent Christ, heard his hidden name proclaimed, referred to him by the title which to them signified his incarnation as a man, and spoken of his revelation to a congregation of believers? Would there have been no comfort to them in Enoch's prophecy that the Son of Man would sit upon his throne of glory to judge angels and men, avenge the bloody persecution of his congregations of saints, and live with them for ever? Some explanation must be found of this extraordinary silence in regard to the *Parables of Enoch*. The exegetes have none to offer, and, in fact do not seem to be conscious of the problem.

Long and earnestly have I looked for traces of a Greek version of this document, but always in vain. At one time it seemed to me possible that the Christian interpolator of *Test. XII Patr.*,

Nephtalim 4, had in mind *Enoch* 46:3; 71:14. Might he not have thought of 'the man who has righteousness' or 'the man who is born for righteousness,' when he spoke of "the coming of the compassion of God, a man having righteousness and doing mercy to those afar off and to those who are near"? If so, the word *ἄνθρωπος*, rather than *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, would be significant. But the context suggests that *δικαιοσύνη* here has the same meaning as in Gen. 20:13, where it is the rendering of *צדק* (Syr. *ܙܕܩܐ*); and the passage is apparently a free creation like *Levi*, chap. 16, being added in the Greek to that which the original author freely paraphrased from *Enoch*. Quite decisive is the fact that these Christian interpolations in *Test. XII Patr.* attach themselves to the most unlikely places in the rest of the work, but never to those passages in the *Parables* that have the strongest Christian affinity.

A reference to this part of *Enoch* also seemed to me possible in Tertullian's words: 'a Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta, sicut et cetera fere quae Christum sonant.'¹⁰¹ May not the description of the 'Son of Man' have been just the part of the book that seemed to him to have reference to Christ? He does not appear to have known the Noachic apocalypse. But this would only show that the interpolations were absent in the Greek copy. Yet the very anxiety of Tertullian to prove to Christians the value of the book renders it improbable that he should have left unquoted the significant passages dealing with 'the Son of Man,' while he exerted himself on behalf of those reciting the errors of the angels. It is probable that 'the other things which had a reference to Christ' were the clumsier interpolations by Christian hands in *Test. XII Patr.*, the *Oracula Sibyllina*, and other books.

Origen, indeed, seems to have been familiar with *En.* 67:6, 7, as his reference to thermal waters indicates.¹⁰² But this chapter belongs to the Noah apocalypse. A hymn in Paris Papyrus 3009, published by Dieterich,¹⁰³ shows in one or two passages a certain similarity to *Enoch* 69:13 ff. Gaster thinks¹⁰⁴ that the author

¹⁰¹ *De cultu feminarum*, i, 3, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, I, col. 1308.

¹⁰² *Contra Celsum*, v, 52, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.*, XI, col. 1261.

¹⁰³ *Abraxas*, 1891, pp. 138 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, 1901, pp. 109 ff.

of this Logos Ebraikos actually quoted the *Book of Enoch* in the second century B. C. He misunderstands Dieterich's conclusions as regards the date. This Gnostic production, in which the name of Jesus occurs, belongs to the second century A. D., and the kinship of ideas is not such as to justify the assumption of acquaintance with the *Book of Enoch*.

A large number of passages have been quoted by Charles and Martin to show literary dependence upon this part of *Enoch* by various New Testament writers. Some of these have a certain resemblance without intimating a dependence, others show a similarity that may be due to the same milieu of ideas, while still others exhibit such a practical identity of language as suggests imitation. There is no direct quotation, however. The only New Testament writer of whom we are certain that he used the *Book of Enoch* is Jude. He quoted his source, but he drew nothing from the *Parables*, though his interest in Christ and in eschatology would have made it most natural for him to do so. His phrase, 'the seventh from Adam,'¹⁰⁵ does not prove that he knew the *Apocalypse of Noah*.¹⁰⁶ If one could count that way, two could. As regards the expressions that really suggest dependence, it is certainly far more difficult to conceive of a Greek version of the *Parables* being used by several New Testament writers, without mention of the work, and then totally disappearing, while other parts of the Enoch literature, not thus honored, were preserved and highly prized, than that the present Ethiopic text has here and there received, in the course of transmission, a certain coloring by Christian hands. While a Greek translation of the *Apocalypse of Noah* may have been known to Origen,¹⁰⁷ there seems, therefore, to be no evidence of a Greek version of the *Parables*. The disappearance of the Aramaic text can cause no surprise. It is through translations, more or less faithful, and more or less interpolated, that we know such works as I *Macc.*, *Baruch*, *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Pss. Sol.*, *Ass. Mosis*, *Jubilees*, *Test. XII Patr.*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Apocalypse of Ezra*, and the *Gospel according to Matthew*.

¹⁰⁵ Jude 14.

¹⁰⁶ *Enoch* 60:8.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Lawlor, *Journal of Philology*, 1897, p. 201.

DHIMMIS AND MOSLEMS IN EGYPT

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL

DHIMMIS AND MOSLEMS IN EGYPT

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL

I

The treatment of protected peoples—Jews, Christians and so-called Sabians—by Islamic rulers forms an interesting chapter in the history of the relations of the conquering Arabs with the peoples whom they subjected. In certain parts of Arabia itself both Jews and Christians were too powerful for Muḥammad to antagonize in such manner as to turn them into open enemies. We know in detail the statutes laid down by the prophet for the Anṣār, the Muhājirīn and for the Jews in Medina.¹ Almost from the very first one of the burning questions related to the churches and the synagogues which either existed before the coming of Islam or which had been built in after times. No authentic tradition has been forthcoming which could fix upon the founder of their religion the responsibility for the later prescripts of rulers and jurists. The only tradition of the prophet which can have reference to the subject is that found in the *Kitāb al-Muwattaʿa* of Mālik to the effect “Two religions cannot exist together in Arabia;”² which tradition is also handed down with a wider meaning as “There cannot be two Kīblas in one country.”³ It

¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, IV, pp. 67 ff.; résumé in Müller, *Der Islam*, I, p. 95.

² On the authority of Abū 'Ubaidah, Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, Cairo, 1893, V. p. 362; لَا تَجْتَمِعُ دِينَانِ فِي جَزِيرَةِ الْعَرَبِ. Al-Muwattaʿa, IV, p. 71 (cited *REJ.*, XXVIII, p. 75); *JA.*, Nov.-Dec., 1851, p. 513. It is also cited from Abū Da'ūd's *Sunan* as a tradition of Ibn 'Abbās by Ibn Taimiyyah, *REJ.*, XXXI, p. 215. See, also, Ṭabari, I, 1987, 13. Another tradition is more direct: أَخْرَجُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ مِنْ جَزِيرَةِ الْعَرَبِ, al-Bukhārī, ed. Krehl, III, p. 295 (cf. al-Hindī, *Kanz al-'Ummāl* in *Musnad*, II, p. 311, margin). A further tradition is to the effect that Muḥammad sent to the Jews in their بَيْتِ الْمَدْرَسِ أَسْلِمُوا تَسْلِمُوا وَعَلِمُوا أَنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلَّهِ (بيت المدرس) at Madinah, saying: أَرِيدُ أَنْ أَجْلِبَكُمْ مِنْ هَذِهِ الْأَرْضِ وَرَسُولُهُ. al-Bukhārī, II, p. 294.

³ لَا تَصْلُحُ قَبْلَتَانِ بَارِضٌ; Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 779; al-Ṭabari, I, p. 1590; Ibn al-Athīr, II, p. 171. Cf. *REJ.*, XXXI, p. 220. Al-Hindī, *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, has the reading, فِي أَرْضٍ وَاحِدَةٍ (*Musnad*, II, p. 308; margin, below).

is true that in the fourteenth century a Shāfi'ite jurisconsult of some eminence in Egypt, one Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Naḳḱāsh, in a fetwa that he wrote in the year 759 A. H. (1357-58 A. D.)⁴ relates a tradition of the prophet that "The building of churches in Moslem countries is forbidden, even the repairing of such as have fallen in ruins;" to which he adds a second one "No churches are to be allowed in Moslem countries."⁵ Unless he has reference to one of the traditions referred to above, his own is worthless, as it is not supported by any Isnād and falls within the category of those called by the traditionists *Munḳaṭiun*.⁶ In fact, it is contravened in express terms by the well-reputed acts and sayings of Muḥammad.⁷ In the Medina statutes it is expressly said that Jews are allowed to keep their religion;⁸ and to the leader of the new forces going to Yemen he sent word "Do not turn the Jews from their religion."⁹ The letter of Muḥammad to the bishop of Najrān, as well as that to the bishop of the Banū al-Ḥārith ibn Ka'b, assuring them of the possession of their churches and of the continuance of their services, may also be cited in evidence.¹⁰

A very similar course had been adopted by the other leaders and by the first caliphs; probably, it is true, for purely political reasons. In the treaty made with the inhabitants of Jerusalem at Jābia 17 A. H. (638 A. D.), Omar promised "security for their persons, their possessions, their churches, their crosses and for all things that concern their cult."¹¹ The same was done at other

⁴ See M. Belin, "Fetwa relatif à la condition des Zimmis," *J.A.*, Nov.-Dec., 1851, pp. 415 ff. Al-Naḳḱāsh was born 720 A. H. (1320 A. D.) and died 763 A. H. (1361). Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, II, p. 247, makes him a follower of Mālik; but, according to Abū al-Maḥāsīn, he was a Shāfi'ite.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 513.

⁶ See the *Taḳrīb* of al-Nawawī in *J.A.*, 1901, p. 492, etc.

⁷ On the falsification of traditions for various purposes, see the illuminating chapter in Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, pp. 88 ff.

⁸ Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, p. 70.

⁹ *وَأَنْ لَا يَفْتَنَ يَهُودِي عَنْ يَهُودِيَّتِهِ* al-Bilādhurī, p. 71.

¹⁰ Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 106, 132, 193. The text is also found in al-Bilādhurī, p. 654, Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, pp. 40, 41 (with slight variants). From this last comes the translation in Sprenger, *Muhammad*, III, p. 502. It is cited in the Fetwa of Ibn Naḳḱāsh, *loc. cit.*, p. 493. Cf. also, Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, II, p. 351.

¹¹ Ṭabarī, I, 2405, al-Ya'qūbī, II, 167: *أَنْتُمْ آمَنُوا عَلَى دِمَائِكُمْ وَأَمْوَالِكُمْ وَكَفَّيْنَاكُمْ لَا تَسْكُنُ وَلَا تُخْرَبُ إِلَّا أَنْ تَحْدُثُوا حَدْثًا عَامًّا* "Securos fore

places, e. g., at Tiberias.¹² In the treaty which Abū 'Ubaidah made with the Syrians, it is expressly stated that churches and synagogues shall be left as they are and not touched; though regulations are attached to prevent the Dhimmis from hurting the sensibilities of the Moslems by the public exhibition of their worship and of their crosses.¹³ The same was the case at Al-'Ānah and in the agreement made with the Catholikos of Al-Naḥīb and al-Kawāthil.¹⁴ Abū Yūsuf adds that these conditions were faithfully carried out by Abū Bakr, Omar, Othman, and Ali. In some cases where a church building was needed for a mosque, a part of it was left for Christian worship; as at al-Anbar¹⁵ or at Damascus, where the Moslems and Christians shared the cathedral of St. John for a space of eighty years.¹⁶ Khālid, the Sword of God, had promised the patriarch security for the persons of the inhabitants, for their possessions, for their churches and for the wall of their city.¹⁷ Under Omar, the demand was made for the contravention of this agreement; but the caliph resolutely opposed it, as did also the Umayyads, Muāwiyah, and 'Abd al-Mālik. Walīd, however, took the whole church by force; and Omar II gave to the Christians in exchange all the churches in the Ghūtah that had been taken by force. Edessa surrendered to 'Iyādh ibn Ghanam on condition that the cathedral and other buildings should be reserved for the Christians; but the latter engaged not to build other churches than those which existed at

psos quod ad vitas suas, et liberos, opes, et ecclesias suas; illas scilicet nec dirutum iri, nec habitatum," Eutychius, ii, 284 (Migne, *Patrologia*, CXI, p. 1099). Cf. Reynolds, *The History of the Temple of Jerusalem tr. from . . . al-Siūti*, London, 1836, p. 168.

¹² Al-Ya'kūbī, ed. Houtsma, II, p. 159.

¹³ فان بيعهم وكنائسهم تركت على حالها ولم تهدم لهم ولم يتعرض لهم فيها. هذا ما كان بالشام بين المسلمين واهل الذمة.

Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, p. 82 below—in the interesting chapter on the relation of Muḥammadans and Dhimmis.

¹⁴ Abū Yūsuf, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵ Al-Bilādhurī, p. 179, 9.

¹⁶ Al-Bilādhurī, p. 125; Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam*, p. 51. The same was done with the Cathedral at Cordova; Ibn 'Adhārī, *al-Bayān al-Mughrib*, ed. Dozy, II, 244; Simonet, *Historia de los Mozarabes de España*, p. 806.

¹⁷ "[Notum sit] me vobis securitatem praestitisse quod ad vitas vestras, domosque, ac opes, et ecclesias vestras, ne diruantur, vel inhabitentur, sed pacifice vobis concedantur," Eutychius, ii, 278 (in Migne, *Patrologia*, CXI, p. 1098).

the time of the conquest¹⁸—a condition which had been implied in the agreement before mentioned, but which does not seem to have been specifically mentioned.

The conditions thus stipulated were in the nature of a compromise, and paved the way for trickery and for deceit upon both sides. Upon the part of the Dhimmis it led to the falsification of documents which were to prove that a special arrangement or agreement had been made, assuring them the possession of one or the other religious edifice. The most noted example of such a falsification is the copy of the agreement said to have been made by Muḥammad with the monks of Mt. Sinai and preserved there to this day.¹⁹ It is drawn up in the usual later documentary style and purports to have been made in the year 2 A. H.; being witnessed to by a goodly array of men: 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Bakr ibn Abī Ḳuḥāfah, Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Othmān ibn 'Affān, Abū Dardā'ī, Abū Hurairah, Abdallāh ibn Mas'ūd, al-'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Fadl ibn 'Abbās, al-Zubair ibn al-'Awwām, and twelve more of Muḥammad's entourage. The writing is claimed to be that of 'Alī and the copy to have been made from a copy of the copy of the copy of the original, as is stated in the colophon. Synagogues were usually disguised as private houses, or with false dates put with a bold front upon the outer part.²⁰ The synagogue of the Palestinians in Fustāṭ had a wooden tablet affixed, which bore a legend to the effect that it had been built in the year 336 of the Seleucid Era, forty-five years before the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem; and the tradition was spread abroad that the famous synagogue in Damwah had been erected forty years after the destruction of the first temple.

Upon the part of the Moslems, traditions were invented to

¹⁸ al-Bilādḥurī, p. 172. It is a question in how far the Moslems followed Roman precedent. In a law of Honorius and Theodosius (423 A. D.) it is expressly said, "Synagogae de cetero nullae protinus extruantur, veteres in sua forma permaneant." Quoted by Sachau, "Von den rechtlichen Verhältnissen der Christen in Sasanidenreich," *Mitt. des Sem. für or. Sprachen*, X, Sonderabdruck, p. 10.

¹⁹ I possess a photographic copy of it. The agreement came to light not earlier than the year 1517 A. D., and is on a line with a similar document stated to have been drawn up in the year 4 A. H. See Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Litteratur*, p. 186. According to Suhrawardī (*As. Quart. Rev.*, XIX, 1905, p. 156) this chart was published in 1630 by Gabriel Sionita. Similar agreements with Zoroastrians exist (*ibid.*, p. 158).

²⁰ *JQR.*, XIX, p. 507.

prove the early age of various later restrictions;²¹ and in the interpretation of early procedure a door was opened for later fanatical casuists to incite the people to destroy the religious edifices of both Christians and Jews. The distinction was made between countries and places which had become Moslem by treaty and such as had been taken by force of arms; naturally a frequent subject of debate. It was a moot point whether such a building might be wholly rebuilt or only repaired; or whether new ones might be erected in villages and in places where there were no outward signs of Muḥammadan worship. And, finally, it was held to be a contravention for non-Moslem edifices to tower above those of Moslems. The history of Muḥammadan countries is full of incidents connected with this subject; and the orthodoxy of a ruler was at times measured by the zeal which he exhibited in taking the strictest view of these provisions.

The Fetwas and the decisions which have come down to us upon this subject are all based upon the supposed pact made by the Caliph Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb with the Dhimmis. Many scholars have doubted the later tradition which ascribes this famous pact to the first caliph of that name. The doubt seems in a large measure justified. According to al-Siūṭī, the earliest authorities to mention it are Ibn Zabr of Damascus who died in the year 164 A. H. (780/1 A. D.) and Abū 'Abdallāh ibn Ishāk ibn Minda who died in 395 A. H. (1004 A. D.).²² We are so well acquainted with the life of the caliph, that so famous an instrument would undoubtedly have been mentioned by his biographers had they known of it. Of still greater force is the fact that its provisions show us a character that accords ill with the uprightness that shines through all the acts of his reign and with the simplicity and the truly religious character of his life.^{22a} It is

²¹ 'Āsim ibn al-Nabil does not scruple to say: "I have learned by experience that the pious are liable to prevaricate in nothing as much as in the Ḥadīth," Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, p. 47. A forged ḥadīth is called **موضوع**. See the *Takrīb* of al-Nawawī, tr. M. Marcais, in *J.A.*, XVII (1901), p. 121.

²² De Goeje, *Mémoire sur la conquête de la Syrie* (2d ed.), Leyden, 1900, p. 143. De Goeje, Muir (*The Caliphate*, p. 213), and Arnold (*The Preaching of Islam*, p. 52) do not believe in Omar's authorship. The latest translation of the document is by E. Amar in the *Revue du monde musulman*, II, p. 356.

^{22a} See on the "Faḍā'il 'Umar," *Musnad*, IV, p. 367.

true that it was he who drove the Jews out of Khaibar and the Christians out of Najrān.²³ Eminent reasons must have seemed to him necessary for this in the interests of the new state; for even in his testament, which has come down to us in two recensions, he is careful to demand consideration for the Dhimmis. "I recommend to your care the Dhimmis, for they enjoy the protection of the prophet; see that the agreement with them is kept, and that no greater burdens than they can carry are laid upon them."²⁴

As the Umayyad dynasty grew in importance, Omar's followers were not all as fine-minded or as far-seeing as he was. In the second Omar (99-101 A. H.) we have a prince very much after the pattern of the first Omar, pious and well intentioned, frugal and upright.²⁵ It is customary to suppose that in his zeal for orthodoxy it was he who made his peace with the orthodox in Medina, and drew up the limitations imposed upon the Dhimmis and registered in the pact.²⁶ But it is hard to imagine that a man of his generous nature would have allowed even his religious

²³ A tradition is reported from the prophet: **اخرجوا يهود من الحجاز واهل** **نجران من جزيرة العرب**, al-Ramli, *Nihāyat al-Muhtāj ila Sharḥ al-Minhāj*, Cairo, 1886, VII, p. 223; but unsupported by an Isnād. Two traditions are ascribed to Omar: **لاخرجن اليهود والنصارى من جزيرة العرب حتى لا ادع الا 1. لئن عشت ان شاء الله لاخرجن اليهود والنصارى من 2. مسلما جزيرة العرب**. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, Cairo, 1893, V, p. 362. For Khaibar, see Ibn Hishām, ed. Wāstenfeld, p. 779; al-Ṭabarī, I, p. 1591; Ibn al-Athir, II, p. 171, and for the later views of his policy in general, al-Abshahī, *Kitāb al-Mustaṭraf*, I, 105.

²⁴ Sachau, "Ueber den zweiten Chalifen Omar," *Sitzungsber. der preuss. Acad.*, March 13, 1902, p. 321 (off-print, p. 30). That he advised his viceroys not to use Jews and Christians in state offices (al-Ṭurtūshī, *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, Cairo, 1901, p. 118 below) was dictated by state reasons. Other conditions ascribed to him were not especially burdensome, al-Hindī, *Kanz* *al-'Ummāl*: **عن الاحنف ابن قيس ان عمر بن الخطاب كان يشترط** **على اهل الذمة ضيافة يوم وليلة وان يصلحوا القناطر وان قتل في ارضهم قتيل من المسلمين فعليهم دينه** (*Musnad*, II, p. 309, margin).

²⁵ See Ibn Jauzī, *Manāqib 'Omar ibn 'Abd el 'Azīz*, ed. C. H. Becker, Berlin, 1900.

²⁶ A letter is quoted in the *Sirat 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz* and in the responsum of al-Nakḥāsh which breathes hatred to all non-Muḥammadans; see *J.A.*, 1851, p. 431; al-Ṭurtūshī, *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, p. 120 middle. This, as well as other directions ascribed to Omar, has little verisimilitude.

zeal to carry him as far as this. Was it not he who decreed that the Dhimmis who had come over to Islam should no longer be called upon to pay the capitulation tax, which meant a large loss to the treasuries of the state?²⁷ Is it not expressly stated that it was he who allowed the Christians and Jews to constitute Waḳfs (mortmain) for churches and synagogues?²⁸ The only tradition of an unfavorable disposition in this respect that has come down to us is found in a letter sent by him to 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Nu'aim: "Do not destroy synagogues or churches or fire temples in regard to which we have made an agreement; but do not allow new churches or fire temples to be built."²⁹

It was really under Abbāsīd rulers at Bagdād that the theologians completely gained the upper hand.³⁰ Al-Manṣūr removed all Dhimmis in the administration³¹—a work continued by al-Mahdi and by Hārūn al-Rashīd, the one for whom Abū Yūsuf had written his *Kitāb al-Kharāj*. It was al-Mutawakkil who, privately living a life of riot but outwardly a most zealous man for all things Muḥammadan,³² increased the duress under which the Dhimmis lived, and who ordered all the churches and the synagogues that had been built in the time of Islam to be pulled down.³³ It seems probable, therefore, that in this Abbāsīd period

²⁷ The attempt is evident in many subjects of later legislation to refer the beginnings of such legislation to the early heroes of Islām. At a very early time Omar II became a center around which traditions of all sorts gathered. See Becker, *loc. cit.*, p. 1.

²⁸ Ibn Sa'ad, *Biographien*, V, p. 262, 15.

²⁹ Ṭabarī, II, p. 1371 below.

³⁰ The view held by orthodox theologians may be seen from the saying attributed to their protagonist Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110 A. H. = 728 A. D.):

من السنة أن تهدم الكنائس التي في الأمصار القديمة والحديثة ويمنع أهل الذمة من بناء ما حرب

³¹ A provision also carried back to Omar I; *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, p. 118 below; al-Muttaḳī, *Kanz al-'Ummāl* margin of *al-Musnad*, VI, 231; al-Ḳalkāshandī, *Subḥ al-A'sha*, I, 39; *J.A.*, 1851, p. 454, *et al.* The retention of Christians in the administrations of Egypt, Syria, and Irāk became a fruitful source of complaint. The Fetwa published by Belin (*loc. cit.*) gives a number of instances; but they were needed, especially in the earlier times. In Egypt, the Copts have always been well represented in the government offices. For the earlier times see Carl H. Becker, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens unter dem Islam*, Strassburg, 1903, II, pp. 114 ff.

³² Eutychius, ii, p. 448 (Migne, *loc. cit.*, p. 1136); Von Kremer, *Herrschende Ideen*, II, pp. 62 ff.; Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, p. 58.

³³ Ṭabarī, III, p. 1390, 2 = Ibn al-Athīr, VII, p. 34 below; al-Ya'ḳūbī, II, 595, 10; al-Turtūshī, *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, p. 118 middle; *J.A.*, 1851, p. 450.

the so-called Pact of Omar was drawn up; and that in order to invest it with greater authority it was foisted upon Omar, the First.³⁴

All this was, of course, meat for the legislators and the codifiers of Muḥammadan law. The chief authorities differed in minor points and the traditions vary in themselves. For this reason it was easy to raise the whole question from time to time and to harass the Dhimmis upon minor points of procedure. Abū Ḥanīfah seems to have held a more liberal opinion. In the *Hidāyah* of al-Marghinānī (d. 593 A. H. = 1197 A. D.) he is said³⁵ to hold that, though it is unlawful to construct churches and synagogues in Muḥammadan territory, those already existing can be repaired if they have been destroyed or have fallen into decay; though they must not be removed from one place to another. Places of prayer may be built in private houses, and such places of prayer may be turned into a Waḳf and handed down as such.³⁶ In villages and hamlets, churches and synagogues may be erected, since the tokens of Islam do not appear there. The Shāfi'ite view, as represented by al-Shirāzī (1061 A. D.), holds³⁷ that in places taken by force, no new houses of prayer may be erected by Dhimmis; but opinion differs, he says, in regard to the permissibility of repairing them. If a special treaty has been made, even the building of new synagogues and temples is allowed. Al-Nawawī (631-76 A. H. = 1233-78 A. D.) holds a stricter view. If a place has been taken by assault, infidels must abstain not only from building new churches but also from employing the edifices already existing. If the place has capitulated, the action of the

وَأَمَّا لِكُنَائِسِ فَاَمْرُ اَنْ تَهْدَمَ كُلَّ كُنَيْسَةٍ لَمْ تَكُنْ قَبْلَ الْاِسْلَامِ وَمَنْعُ اَنْ تُخَدَّثَ كُنَيْسَةٌ وَاَمْرُ اَنْ لَا تُظْهَرَ عَلَيْهِ خَارِجَةٌ مِنْ كُنَيْسَةٍ وَلَا يُظْهَرَ صَلِيبٌ خَارِجٌ مِنْ كُنَيْسَةٍ الْخ. *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, p. 120 middle.

³⁴ Book IX, chap. viii.

³⁵ Book LII, chap. vi; though the authorities seem to be divided upon this point. See Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaibānī, *al-Jāmi' al-Saghīr*, on the margin of Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj* (Cairo, 1885), p. 127.

³⁷ *Al-Tanbih*, ed. de Jong, p. 297.

Dhimmi in regard to their place of worship depends upon the conditions made; if the Dhimmi are to remain proprietors of the soil, they may even build new places of worship.³⁸ Mālik holds³⁹ that in places taken by force, new houses of worship may be erected and old ones repaired only when a stipulation to that effect has been made in the treaty. Where the inhabitants have capitulated, new edifices may be erected⁴⁰ and portions of the property may be sold. In countries Moslem in their origin, no new churches are to be built.

The severest view seems to have been held by Ibn Ḥanbal (164–241 A. H. = 780–855 A. D.); even in the neighborhood of Muḥammadan cities such houses of prayer cannot be erected, nor can they be restored when damaged or ruined.⁴¹ Minor authorities went still further in making all manner of subtle distinctions. Thus, according to Abū Sa'īd al-Istakhrī (d. 320 A. H. = 932 A. D.) a wall might be repaired on the inside but not on the outside; though al-Ramlī (d. 1596 A. D.) would prohibit even this.⁴² In general it was stipulated that such buildings could be as high as those of the Moslems but not higher; though this was not the view of all the legal authorities.⁴³ That theoretically at least these restrictions applied, may be seen from what follows as well as from the fact that they are expressly mentioned in the diploma which it was customary to give to the Ra'īs al-Yahūd as cited by Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Umarī and in the *Kitāb al-Inshā*. These provisions are

³⁸ *Minhāj al-Ṭālibīn*, ed. Van der Berg, III, p. 284. See, also, the Comments of al-Ramlī (Cairo, 1886), VII, p. 229.

³⁹ Khalīl ibn Ishāq (d. ca. 1422 A. D.) *al-Mukhtaṣar* (Fēz, 1882), p. 115, and the comments of al-Kharashī (ca. 1680), Bulak, 1882, p. 171. A translation of the passage can be found in Perron, *Précis de jurisprudence Musulmane* [Explor. scientifique de l'Algérie, XI, Paris, 1849], p. 295.

⁴⁰ The commentator adds, "restore ruined churches."

⁴¹ See the excellent exposé of this whole question in al-Sha'rānī's *Mizān*, II, p. 211, translated by Goldziher in *ZDMG.*, XXXVIII, p. 673.

⁴² VII, p. 230 top. See, also, Muḥammad ibn 'Abdallāh al-Khirshī, *Sharḥ al-Muḥaḳiḳk*, Bulak, 1882, III, p. 171.

⁴³ Al-Ṭurṭūshī, *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, p. 120 middle; Goldziher in *REJ.*, XXX, p. 19 top. Various special treatises have been written upon the subject, e. g., by Taḳī al-Dīn ibn Taimiyyah (707 A. H. = 1307 A. D.), the fanatical Cadi of Damascus (Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, II, p. 100), and by Aḥmad al-Damanhūrī (ca. 1759 A. D.); cf. *JQR.*, XIX, p. 491. Ḥājī Khalīfah (VI, p. 364) mentions **كشف الدسائس في ترميم الكنائس** by Najm al-Dīn al-Rifā'ah (Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, II, p. 133). Taḳī al-Dīn al-Subkī wrote, **كشف الدسائس في ترميم الكنائس**. See Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Litteratur*, p. 78.

referred to in the early capitulations and have remained in force even down to our own days. In the celebrated Ḥatti-Humāyūn of 1856, it is expressly stated that repairs could be made in the churches according to their original plan, but not exceeding their original extent.⁴⁴

II

In view of what has preceded we can readily understand why the question was so largely debated whether the Moslems had become possessed of Egypt by treaty or by force. Al-Maḡrīzī has a whole chapter on the taking of Fustāṭ from this point of view,⁴⁵ and so has al-Siyūṭī.⁴⁶ The doubts that really existed as regards the first and the second capture of the fortress of Babylon paved the way for lengthy disputes. In Egypt, for the most part, an express stipulation, though vague in its terms, was entered into. In the treaty made with the Copts in October, 640,^{46a} it was stated: this is the security which 'Amr ibn al-'Āsī gave to the people of Egypt, "for themselves, their religious bodies, their possessions, their churches and their crosses."⁴⁷ The bishop John of Nikiu is the best witness to the statesmanship that guided these pioneers of the new régime. He says expressly that as long as Omar lived he preserved the churches from pillage.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ F. Eichmann, *Die Reformen des osmanischen Reiches*, 1858, p. 250. Text in Young, *Corps de droit ottoman*, Oxford, 1905, II, p. 5. G. Pélisse du Rausas, *Le régime des capitulations*, Paris, 1902, I, p. 200.

⁴⁵ Khīṭaṭ, I, p. 294.

⁴⁶ Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍarah (Cairo, 1903-4), I, p. 69; cf. Bilādhurī, p. 214; al-Ya'kūbī, II, p. 169; Yāḳūt, III, p. 897; Abū al-Maḥāsīn, I, p. 23, and Butler, *Arab Conquest of Egypt*, pp. 275, 322. Siyūṭī, *Hist. of the Califs*, tr. H. S. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1881, p. 136. Muḳaddasī, ed. de Goeje, p. 212; ibn Rushd in *Homenaje à D. Francisco Codera*, p. 75.

^{46a} At the fortress of Babylon and not at Alexandria, as Butler, *loc. cit.*, p. 324, says. See Lane-Poole, "Mohammedan Treaties with Christians," *Proc. Royal Irish Acad.*, 1904, pp. 227 ff.

⁴⁷ Ṭabarī, I, p. 2588; Abū al-Maḥāsīn, I, 26. This was in the year 28 A. H. (Nov. 8, 641). See Guest, "Fustat and its Khittahs," *JRAS.*, 1907, p. 32.

⁴⁸ John of Nikiu, ed. Zotenberg, p. 262; cf. Butler, *loc. cit.*, p. 320. Severus ibn al-Muḳaffah, however, speaks of the destruction of churches in Alexandria, and especially of that of St.

Mark in 643/4: وفي سنة ثلثمائة وستين لديقلاديانوس في شهر الدركطيس الاول من بعد ان ملك عمر مصر ثلثة سنين ملكت المسلمين مدينة الاسكندرية وهدموا سورها واحرقوا بيع كثير بالنار وبيعة مري مرقس الذي هي مبنية على البحر (MS Bibl. Nat., 302, 1, p. 92).

In regard to Fustāt, the preliminary negotiations guaranteed safety only for those in the fortress and for their possessions.⁴⁹ But this was a military and not a political convention, and no mention was made of churches or synagogues.

In respect to the City of Cairo itself no real doubt could exist. It was in every way a Muḥammadan foundation; and all the schools and all the legists were in accord that no house of prayer could be built there by the Dhimmis.⁵⁰ Yet, in spite of the distinct provisions, there can be no doubt that the regulation was honored very often in the breach. The Copts were too important a part of the population, and their assistance in the building-up of Muḥammadan rule was too necessary to warrant any great interference with their church liberty.^{50a} The Jews also were left in the enjoyment of their synagogues; and eyes were closed by considerations of policy even when the clearest provisions of the treaty were set at naught. Butler has called attention to the fact that the patriarch Benjamin received moneys for the purpose of building a church in Alexandria; that the patriarch John of

⁴⁹ In Fustāt quite a number of the churches were in existence before the conquest—all of them upon the bank of the Nile. See Guest, *loc. cit.*, p. 62. The actual words in the agreement were: *وان نقرّ اموالهم وكنوزهم في ايديهم*. Bilādihūrī, p. 215;

cf. p. 218. Al-Makrīzī has: *ارضكم ودمائكم واموالكم*, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, I, p. 292; cf. Abū al-Maḥāsīn, I, p. 20.

⁵⁰ Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, p. 88 top: *وامّا مصر مصرتة العرب فليس بانّ الكنائس*; *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 511: *لهم ان تحدثوا فيه بيعة ولا كنيسة التي بصر لم تبين الا في الاسلام في زمن العكابة والتابعين*. Abū al-Maḥāsīn, I, p. 462, has the same words. In a responsum of the year 846 we read: *انّ كلّ ما بايدى اليهود من الكنائس محدث لم يصالحوا عليه ولا على ما بايدى اليهود من الكنائس محدث لم يصالحوا عليه ولا على شيء منه*, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-masbūk fi dhail al-Sulūk*, Bulak, 1897, p. 38. The consequences of this stricter view are drawn by 'Alī al-Shabramilī (ca. 1640 A. D.) in his super-commentary to Nawawī (on the margin of al-Ramlī), p. 229 below: *وبه نعلم وجوب هدم ما في مصرنا ومصر القديمة من الكنائس الموجودة الآن*. But see note 49.

^{50a} Abū Ṣāliḥ "is full of instances of benevolence shown to the Copts and practical favours conferred upon them by Mahometan rulers and officials;" *Introd.*, p. xx. See, also, Casanova in *Bulletin de l'inst. français*, I, 126.

⁵¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 449.

Samanūd (680–89) did indeed build such a church; and that in 693 the ruler of Egypt, 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Marwān actually gave orders that a church should be erected in the newly built city of Ḥulwān.⁵² In spite of the facts mentioned above, during the governorship of 'Uḡbah ibn Muslim (104 A. H. = 722 A. D.), "the churches were destroyed and the crosses broken," upon the express order of the Caliph Yazīd.⁵³ Abū Ṣāliḥ tells us that at some time between 775 and 779 the "Churches of Fustāṭ" had been destroyed; but that some time later they were restored again with the express permission of the governor, whose name, however, is not mentioned.⁵⁴

As time went on and the Muḥammadan power grew stronger over Egypt, things changed for the worse. Every now and then the fanaticism of the rulers or of the populace called to the mind of both Christians and Jews that they were subject races. Abū Ṣāliḥ tells us that in the year 725 a bake-house near to the church of St. Mennas was turned into a church of St. George; that much opposition to this change manifested itself upon the part of the populace, and that the Christians were forced to explain "that the bake-house rightfully belonged to this great church and was not a new building."⁵⁵ In 169 A. H. (785 A. D.) the church of St. Mary in Fustāṭ was pulled down by the Governor 'Alī ibn Sulaimān;⁵⁶ but was rebuilt under Mūsa ibn 'Isa two years later.⁵⁷ About the year 330 A. H. (942 A. D.) Abū Muḥammad ibn Tughj, the Ikhshīd had the Melkite church in Tinnīs closed.⁵⁸ The mad al-Ḥākim did not, of course, spare the Dhimmis. In one of his momentary aberrations he ordered the church

⁵² "The Church of the Chamberlains." See the account in Eutychius, ii, 369 [Migne, CXI, p. 1119]. At a later time it was called "Church of Ste. Mary," *ibid.*, p. 430 [Migne, p. 1132]. Cf. also, Abū Ṣāliḥ, *Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, tr. B. T. A. Evetts, p. 157.

⁵³ *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 493 top; Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Copten*, p. 55. Abū al-Maḥāsīn (I, p. 278), however, says nothing about the churches. Becker tries to find the reason for this attack upon the churches in matters relating to the taxing of the monks; *Beiträge zur Gesch. Aegyptens*, II, p. 105.

⁵⁴ Tr. Evetts, pp. 84 ff.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁵⁶ *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 511; Abū al-Maḥāsīn says merely (I, p. 456), **وهدم لكنائس**; cf. p. 461 below.

⁵⁷ *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 494 below.

⁵⁸ Ibn Sa'īd in his life of Ibn Tughj says that in the year 323 A. H. (935 A. D.) part of the church of Abū Shanūdah (Sinuthius) in Fustāṭ had fallen in. The Christians contributed money to repair it. The doctors of the law were asked whether this was permissible. The

in the Khaṭṭ Rashīdah outside Fuṣṭāṭ to be destroyed and the church in al-Maks to be burnt.⁵⁹ He had at one time the intention of razing all the churches in Egypt, or of turning them into mosques. He even caused the Adhān to be recited from the top of the church of Shenūdi in Fuṣṭāṭ and the Muallaḳah church in Ḳaṣr al-Sham' to be walled in.⁶⁰ The tale is told that between the years 403–5 A. H. more than 1,030 churches were thus destroyed in Egypt and in Syria.⁶¹ The Jews were treated with a similar harshness. Al-Ḥākim cleared out the whole Jaudariyyah quarter where the Jews dwelt, and turned their synagogue into a mosque.⁶² He did the same with the synagogue of the Karaites near the Ḥārat al-Rūm, named after Sām ibn Nūḥ.⁶³ And yet, it is during this whole period that a number of churches and synagogues were built and rebuilt both in Fuṣṭāṭ and in Cairo. The orthodox al-Ghazālī was worried by this fact; and he accounts for it by saying that for nearly two hundred years Egypt was in

Shāfi'ite Ibn Ḥaddād and the Mālikite Cadi were against the rebuilding; but Muḥammad ibn 'Alī held that permission might be accorded the Christians to raze the church and to rebuild it. The populace, however, strongly objected; and Ibn Tughj sent Ibn Ḥaddād with certain architects to see if the building was really in a ruinous state. It was found to be in a better condition than had been represented and it was allowed to remain as it was. See *Kitāb al-Mughrib*, Book IV, ed. Tallqvist, Leyden, 1899, p. 63. For the church, see *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 511 middle.

⁵⁹ *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 495 middle.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 497. Among others, he turned part of the monastery and church of St. John the Baptist into a mosque. Abū Ṣāliḥ, ed. Evetts, p. 130; de Sacy, *Les Druses*, I, pp. 330, 336. Cf. Siyūṭī, *Hist. of the Califs*, tr. H. S. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1881, p. 434.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*; Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. der Copten*, p. 26. In 411 A. H. (1019 A. D.), however, he gave orders that the churches which had been destroyed should be rebuilt; and he even restored to the Christians the property which had been taken from them; Ibn Khallikan, tr. de Slane, III, p. 431.

⁶² Severus ibn al-Muḳaffah, MS Bibl. Nat., 302, II, p. 105; *Khiṭaṭ*, II, pp. 5, 464; al-Ḳalkashandī, tr. Wüstenfeld, p. 73; Ibn Iyās, *Ta'rikh Miṣr*, I, p. 51. The occasion is thus related by Sambari (MS Alliance Isr. Univ., Paris, fol. 27a; Neubauer's ed. has omitted the passage):

והרס בתי כנסיות של היאודים ולאחר שבעה ימים חזר אותם לדתם איש איש על עבודתו ועל משאו ובנה פעם שנית הכנסיות שלהם ובליל פסח שרה היאודים במחוז שלהם נקרא אלגודרייא. והסיבה שהיה עובר בהחבא בליל פסח ושמע קול היאודים מקרים את ההגדה לבניהם ומפרשים להם בלשון ערבי. ויהי כאשר שמע שהיו אומרים וימות מלך מצרים ויאנחו בני ישראל חשב שהיו מקללים אותו שימות. ויחר אפו עליהם ויאמר להם למה שלמתם רעה תחת טובה. זה הדבר אשר החזרתי אותם לדתם. ותנתן דת על היאודים אשר במצרים וסגר המחוז שבהם ושרה אותם בלילה אחד והנשארים ברחו ונמלטו. ומזה הסיבה החרימו חכמי מצרים שלא ולמדו עוד את בניהם בלשון אלשרה.

⁶³ See my remarks in *JQR.*, XIX, p. 510.

the hands of Schismatics—Ismailians, Carmathians, Bāṭinites, and Nuṣairies, who outwardly were Rāfidites, but who ought not to be considered as orthodox.⁶⁴

During the period which saw Saladin and his family in possession of Egypt (564–650 A. H. = 1169–1252 A. D.) we have no record of any annoyance having been caused to the Dhimmis in this respect. Only occasionally were churches pillaged by the mob; as the church of the angel Gabriel in 564 A. H. (1168–69 A. D.), the church of St. Mennas, of St. Onuphrius and the church of St. Mercurius at about the same time.⁶⁵ It was especially during the Mameluke rule that the Dhimmis were many times seriously threatened, largely because of fanatic Ulamas and others whose hot words incited the dormant power to act. In the year 700 A. H.⁶⁶ (1300 A. D.) during the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir, and largely upon the advice of a perferbid convert from Judaism, Saʿid ibn Ḥasan of Alexandria,⁶⁷ the so-called pact of Omar was solemnly renewed by representatives of both Jews and Christians and in the presence of the chief cadis of the four rites; though not before a number of synagogues had been destroyed and others closed for a whole year.⁶⁸ The matter was taken up by the Christian king of Barcelona who in the year 703 A. H. (1303–4 A. D.) sent an embassy to secure the reopening of the churches. Embassies with similar purposes in view came from Georgia and from Constantinople.⁶⁹ Two of the confiscated

⁶⁴ *REJ.*, XXXI, p. 216. But see, also, de Sacy, *Les Druses*, I, p. 399. De Sacy (*ibid.*, p. 401) has a note to the effect that al-Makrizi had read in the chronicles of the Christians how the Jacobite patriarch Michael had been forced by the exactions of Aḥmad ibn Ṭūlūn (254–70 A. H.) to sell the Church al-Muallaḳah in the Ḳaṣr al-Sham'. But the passage (*Khīṭaṭ*, I, p. 103 top) says only that he sold "the church near to the Muallaḳah." This was probably the church of St. Michael; see Butler, *Ancient Coptic Churches*, p. 168. In the Paris MS of Severus ibn al-Muḳaffah (Bibl. Nat., 302, p. 248) there is an account of the destruction of a number of churches in the year 808 of the Martyrs (= 1091–92), especially of the al-Zuhri and al-Ḥamrā churches. Professor Derenbourg, however, is inclined to emend the date to 880 (1163–64).

⁶⁵ Evetts, *Abū Ṣāliḥ*, pp. 95, 106, 111, 119.

⁶⁶ This is the date (end of Rajab) as given by al-Makrizi, *Khīṭaṭ*, II, p. 498 below. See Ibn Iyas, *Ta'rikh Miṣr*, I, p. 143; Quatremère, *Sultans Mamlouks*, II, 2, p. 177.

⁶⁷ Goldziher in *REJ.*, XXXI, p. 8; S. A. Weston, "The Kitāb Masālik an-Nazar of Saʿid ibn Ḥasan," *JAS.*, XXIV, pp. 312 ff.

⁶⁸ The increased severity in the conditions imposed is seen in the details given by al-Nuwairi. See Quatremère, *Sultans Mamlouks*, II, 2, p. 178.

⁶⁹ *Khīṭaṭ*, II, p. 499; Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, IV, pp. 268 ff.; Lane-Poole, *Egypt*, p. 301 (cf. Sambari in Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, I, pp. 135, 22). The affair is fully related in Quatremère, *Sultans Mamlouks*, II, 2, pp. 179, 229.

churches were now opened; but the severity of the edicts was not wholly relaxed until the year 710 A. H. (1310 A. D.).

To this period belongs the collection of Fetwas published by Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ and contained in MS Berlin No. 928 of the Landberg collection. From these Fetwas it appears that the synagogues had been closed at some time previous to this in Cairo. In order to circumvent the law, the Jews had held services in a large building which they used as a synagogue, although on the outside it had the appearance of a simple dwelling-place. Ibn al-Raḥāh had given a responsum to the effect that they should be closed; and so had the ill-famed Ibn Taimiyyah. The matter was brought before the vizier Sulaimān, on the charge that such reunions were equivalent to the building of new synagogues. We are not informed what the outcome of the affair was.⁷⁰ A little later, in the year 720 A. H. (1320 A. D.) and under the rule of the same al-Nāṣir a number of churches were destroyed; but this was against the will and contrary to the wishes of the Sultan. On a Friday, the ninth of Rabi', the second, and evidently at a pre-concerted signal, the cry "destroy the churches" was raised in the mosque of the citadel, in the Azhar and in other places. Not only did the churches Bumana, al-Zuhri, al-Ḥamra, al-Banāt, etc., suffer; but the cry was taken up at Alexandria, at Kūs, and at other places. It does not seem that the synagogue suffered at this time.⁷¹ In 752 A. H. (1351 A. D.) during the reign of Ṣāliḥ, some churches were again devastated.⁷² A few years later, in 755 A. H. (1354 A. D.) on account of the arrogant bearing of the Dhimmis (this at least is the Moslem account), the "pact" was once more solemnly affirmed in the presence of the representatives of these Dhimmis; which, however, did not stay the hands of the destroyer, many churches being destroyed not only in Fuṣṭāṭ and in Cairo but also in upper Egypt.⁷³

⁷⁰ See the fetwa published by Schreiner in *REJ.*, XXXI, p. 218; another one by Abū al-Barakāt Aḥmad al-Dardir (Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, II, p. 353) is mentioned in *JA.*, 1852, p. 110.

⁷¹ *Khīṭaṭ*, II, pp. 512, 513 (Wästenfeld, *Copten*, text, p. 51). A lengthy account is given by al-Sakhāwī, *Al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, pp. 72 ff. Cf. also Quatremère, *Memoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Egypte*, II, pp. 225 ff.; Weil, *loc. cit.*, IV, p. 498.

⁷² Weil, *loc. cit.*, IV, p. 498.

⁷³ *Khīṭaṭ*, II, p. 499 below. See also the remark of Joseph ibn Ḥabīb upon the difficulties experienced by the Jews in these matters, cited by Goldziher, *REJ.*, XXX, p. 7, n. 6.

How slight an incident might lead the populace to a fanatical outburst was seen in the following century. In the year 823 the Jews had constructed a new lane in their quarter, and a wall around a number of houses that had formerly belonged to Moslems. The populace thought this to be an unwarranted assumption of rights, and prepared to destroy the synagogue near by. They were prevented from doing this by the strategy of the historian and writer Aḥmad ibn Ḥajar who must already have occupied some judicial position, and who had the new construction pulled down secretly so as to do away with the cause of complaint.⁷⁴ It was during the rule of Bars Bai 825-42 A. H. (1422-38 A. D.), known for his harshness against both Jews and Christians, that the various edicts against the Dhimmis were renewed.⁷⁵ The Sinaitic Peninsula had from time immemorial been, as it were, an appanage of the Egyptian power; and the question of the churches and monasteries there had been raised from time to time. In the year 849 A. H. (1445 A. D.), the whole question regarding these religious edifices was brought to the notice of the Sultan Jaḫmaḫ by the Ḥanafite Cadi Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kibānī and the Ḥanbalite preacher Shams al-Dīn ibn 'Alī Omar.⁷⁶ Measures were then concerted to prevent further buildings of such nature being erected, and especial care was taken that none of them should be higher than were the mosques in their neighborhood.

A few years previous to this in 846 A. H. (1442 A. D.) the above-mentioned Ibn Ḥajar⁷⁷ was concerned in a matter which has direct bearing upon the document published below.⁷⁸ It seems that a

⁷⁴ Quatremère, *Sultanes Mamlouks*, I, 1, p. 214, in the life of Ibn Ḥajar.

⁷⁵ Muir, *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 137.

⁷⁶ Al-Sakhāwī, *loc. cit.*, p. 124.

⁷⁷ Shihāb al-Dīn Abū-l-Faḍl Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥajar, the celebrated authority on Ḥadīth and Fiqh and the voluminous writer on these and also upon biographical subjects. See Brockelmann, *Gesch. der arab. Lit.*, II, p. 67, *JAOS.*, XXVII, pp. 227 ff.; Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss der arab. HSS. der K. Bibl. zu Berlin*, X, p. 125; al-Sakhāwī, *loc. cit.*, pp. 230, 273. Goldziher (*ZDMG.*, XXXV, p. 148) has called attention to the valuable material to be found in Ibn Ḥajar's historico-biographical works.

⁷⁸ See an account of the whole matter in al-Sakhāwī, *loc. cit.*, pp. 35 ff. Codex 663 in the university library at Leipzig, fol. 22b, contains the text of the pact as it was renewed at this

time: هذا عهد كتب على أهل الذمة في دولة السلطان الملك الظاهر جيقف بسؤال أهل الذمة وإقرار مولانا قاضي القضاة الشيخ شهاب

charge had been brought against the Karaites that a building known as the Dār Ibn Sumaikh, and situated in the Zuwailah quarter had been used for some time as a school-house and as a dwelling-place for children. This had been turned into a synagogue.⁷⁹ The gate leading to this building on the western side faced the property of one Samau'al al-Naḥīk.⁸⁰ The title of the Karaites to the property was questioned before Afḍal al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Sirāj al-Dīn Omar al-Karmī, on the ground that Ibn Sumaikh had died without leaving any heirs, and that the property legally reverted to the fiscus. The Karaites had no document to validate their possession of the building, and on Muḥarram 12 a decree was rendered against them. The Sultan Jaḥmaḥ intervened, ordered that the matter should be laid before him, and summoned Johannis,⁸¹ the Jacobite patriarch, Philoteus,⁸² the Melkite, 'Abd al-Laṭīf, head of the Rabbinite Jews, Faraj Allāh, a Karaite sheikh, and Abraham, the head of the Samaritans. These, unfortunately, knew nothing at all about the "pact," which was solemnly renewed and its provisions affirmed. Jaḥmaḥ was known as a scrupulous Moslem and in 851 A. H. (1447 A. D.) had before him the question of the Melkite church in Fuṣṭāṭ, the wall of which had been raised higher than the mosque at its side.⁸³ A certain Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Konstantīnī a Shāfi'ite,⁸⁴ is especially noted for his zeal in the

الدين أحمد بن حجر العسقلاني الشافعي في سابع ربيع الأول سنة
ست وأربعين وثمانى مئة . Professor A. Fischer has kindly sent me a copy of the

passage. In his *Kitāb inbā al-ghumr bi-ibnā al-'umr*, dealing with the events that happened during his own lifetime, Ibn Ḥajar gives a detailed history of the affair. I have copied the text from MSS Bibl. Nat. 1602, and Berlin 9461, s. v. "Muḥarram 846," and hope to return to it at some future time.

⁷⁹ This must be the synagogue referred to by al-Makrīzī (*Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 368) as the كنيسة ابن شيخ near to the Madrasah al-Āshūriyyah in the Zuwailah quarter. Sambari (in *Med. Jewish Chronicles*, I, p. 136) calls it כניסתן צומח . See *JQR.*, XIX, p. 512.

⁸⁰ Al-Sakhāwī, *loc. cit.*, p. 37, 1; Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbā al-ghumr*, MS Bibl. Nat. 1602, fol. 262b. Evidently this must be "Samuel ha-Nagid." In the *Jewish Encycl.*, V, s. v. "Egypt," I have put together all that is at present known of these Egyptian Negidīm. Samuel's name, however, does not occur there!

⁸¹ Text has مؤنس !

⁸² Text has فتوتاس .

⁸³ Al-Sakhāwī, *loc. cit.*, p. 145.

⁸⁴ Born ca. 754 A. H. (1353 A. D.); d. 852 A. H. (1448 A. D.). See *ibid.*, pp. 229 ff.

destruction of the religious edifices of the Dhimmis. Under his direction the church in the *Ḳasr al-Sham'* was turned into a mosque; and his religious vengeance was wreaked upon the synagogues and churches both in *Fuṣṭāṭ* and in *Damwah*. In the year 858 A. H. (1454 A. D.) certain repairs had been made by the Karaites to one of their synagogues. The permission requisite for this had been acquired from the authorities; but it was supposed that this permission was general in its character and applied equally to the churches of the Christians and to the synagogues of the Jews. The Christians therefore commenced to make the repairs needed in their churches. This general activity on the part of the Dhimmis seems to have angered the strict Moslems; and in the year 860 the matter was brought to the attention of the Sultan Ashraf Saif al-Dīn Īnāl. A careful examination was twice made, not only of the synagogue in question, but also of the religious edifices in *Fuṣṭāṭ*. It was found that the Karaites had not exceeded the permission granted to them, but that the Christians had. The demand was made by the Moslems that all the churches should be torn down as an example; because the agreement entered into by the patriarch with the Moslems had not been observed. Judgment was given to the effect that only those parts of the churches should be torn down which had been repaired without the necessary permission from the authorities. The Karaites were confirmed in the possession of their synagogue, and the whole status of the Dhimmis was traversed; a document being drawn up giving an account of what had happened in the year 846 A. H., of the decisions that had been reached, of the renewal of the "pact" made at that time, and the action taken in the year 860.

A copy of this document has been preserved in the archives attached to the office of the Karaite Ḥakam Basha in Cairo, and is published in the following. It is written upon a paper scroll many yards in length and over a foot in breadth.⁸⁵ The original, I suppose, was deposited in the state archives; but it has probably

⁸⁵ It is surprising how few documents from the Egyptian chancelleries have come down to us — a fact remarked also by Van Berchem (*Corpus Inscript. Arabic.*, p. 441). For many reasons they have a distinct value; especially, because they are seldom given in their entirety by the Muḥammadan annalists. In the earlier documents, there is a great waste

gone the way of most of such documents. Even this copy has been roughly handled and not carefully guarded, so that portions of it are illegible. How many lines are wanting at the beginning it is impossible to tell; but citations made in the body of the document show that a lengthy introduction preceded what has been preserved. A transcript was made for me by Abū Naṣr al-Nabulsi, one of the sheikhs of the Azhar.

In the translation I have followed the original somewhat slavishly. I have, however, in most cases omitted the honorific designations with which the official scribes were accustomed to adorn the names of dignitaries in such documents.⁸⁶ In the case of rulers and sultans these designations have a direct value as indicating the possession or supposed possession of certain rights.^{86a} But in the case of jurists and ʿadīs, they are nothing more than ballast. The official style of the kātibs is perhaps no worse and no more crabbed than is the style usually found in our own legal documents; but it is difficult to translate into readable English, and if the thread is interrupted by long lists of titles, it becomes perfectly unintelligible.

III

. . . . as the honorable law decides on the opinion of the one who has brought the action . . . as this was explained in the decision given on the twenty-third of Dhū-l-Ḥijjah 858. The above-mentioned indorsement was given of our Lord and Master⁸⁷ the Sheikh al-Islām, the learned al-Kinānī al-Bulḳinī,⁸⁸ the Shāfiʿite above mentioned, May God prolong his

of space, the letters being written in a large hand and the lines being far apart. Omar the first tried to remedy this; but without success (Becker, *Papyri Schott-Reinhardt*, I, p. 25). In later times the scribes became wasteful of words, and the documents attained unheard-of lengths. The form of such documents seems to be modeled upon the old Egyptian papyri.

⁸⁶ Titles of rulers and other officials have been studied with great care and with much profit by Van Berchem in his numerous publications on Arabic epigraphy; especially in his *Corpus*, pp. 441 ff. See also his "L'Épigraphie musulmane en Algérie," in *La revue africaine*, 1905, No. 257.

^{86a} Especially in Mameluke times great stress was laid upon such titles. The *Divān al-Inshāʾ* (MS Paris. Arabe, 4439) contains much material upon the subject, and was written in Egypt about the time of our document.

⁸⁷ According to Van Berchem (*Corpus*, p. 384) the title, مولانا, was given only to sultans and princes in early times. It was only in the fifteenth century that it commences to be used for functionaries and sheikhs. To say سيدنا before مولانا, as is here the case, is an Egyptian practice, dating from the time of Muḥammad ibn Ḳalāʾūn (*ibid.*, p. 386).

⁸⁸ Probably Šāliḥ ibn ʿUmar ibn Raslān al-Bulḳinī, 791 A. H. (1389 A. D.)-868 A. H. (1463); Brockelmann, *Gesch. der arab. Lit.*, II, p. 96; Ibn Iyās, *Taʾrikh Miṣr*, II, pp. 9 ff. (see *Index s. v.* "al-Šāliḥ").

days, his power and his grace, and may he watch over his judicial substitute our master, the servant who is desirous of Allāh the Most High, the Sheikh, the Imam the very wise Shihāb al-Dīn, the glory of the Ulamas, the most excellent one, the Mufti of the Muḥammadans, Abū al-'Abbās al-'Asḳalānī, al-Shāfi'ī,⁸⁹ the judicial deputy in Egypt (May God aid his judgment, recompense him . . . crown his purpose with success!).

The contents were established before him in a legal manner; and in conformity with this he rendered a legal judgment, as his signature shows that is put on the outside of the document referred to, and which is dated in his own handwriting⁹⁰ the fourth day of the blessed month Ṣafar in the year given there.

There was presented to our Master and Lord the Chief Cadi, the Sheikh al-Islām, chief of all the wise men, the learned al-Kinānī al-Bulkīnī al-Shāfi'ī and to our Master and Lord the Chief Cadi, Sheikh al-Islām al-Sa'dī al-'Abbāsī al-Dairī the Ḥanafite above mentioned⁹¹ (May God prolong their days, establish them in opulence, show them kindness and cover them with blessings in both worlds) the holy pact which was renewed with the Dhimmis in the glorious Zahirite dynasty,⁹² the provisions of which are explained in it—each one having pondered over it sufficiently—as well as that which was written upon its border and attributed to our Lord and Master, the Chief Cadi Badr al-Dīn, Cadi of the Muḥammadans, friend of the Commander of the Faithful, Abū al-Akhlāṣ Muḥammad al-Zubairī al-Tinnisi⁹³ the Mālikite, the inspector of justice in Egypt and the other Islamic provinces (May God cover him with mercy and faith); as well as whatsoever the decision contained which is written upon the margin of the copy of the pact aforementioned, which has reference to our Lord and Master the Chief Cadi Badr al-Tinnisi the Mālikite mentioned in it (the explanation of which will be given); and the testimony in regard

⁸⁹ I. e., Ibn Ḥajar.

⁹⁰ I do not know whether الكبير is simply a honorific adjective, or whether reference is made to a large script as opposed to a small one. Al-Ḳalkāshandī (tr. Wāstenfeld, p. 189) distinguishes between التوقيع بالقلم الدقيق and التوقيع بالقلم الجليل.

⁹¹ I. e., Sa'd al-Dīn ibn al-'Abbās al-Dairī. See Ibn Iyās, *Ta'rikh Miṣr*, II, pp. 33, 35, etc.; 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Hindī, *Al-Fawā'id al-Bahiyyah*, Cawnpore, 1876, p. 35.

⁹² This evidently refers to Jaḳmaḳ, whose title was al-Zāhir Saif al-Dīn. The Mamelukes called themselves or their various parties according to the titles of the sultans to whom they belonged. They used the same designations for the reigns of the various princes. See Muir, *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 149, note; Lane-Poole, *A History of Egypt*, p. 253, note; Van Berchem, *Corpus*, p. 76.

⁹³ Or, al-Tannasī. See al-Dhahabī, *al-Mushtabih*, p. 42, 1. It will be seen that relative adjectives are frequently used here in place of proper names or of titles; these, according to Van Berchem (*Corpus*, pp. 443 ff.), are always addressed to a functionary and not to a sovereign. Al-Badrī = Badr al-Dīn; Saifī = Saif al-Dīn; al-Sa'dī = Sa'd al-Dīn. If the person was a Mameluke, the relative may be derived from the name of the man's owner. Ibn Iyās, *loc. cit.*, pp. 35, 36, has التوسی; but see al-Siyūṭī, *Ḥusn*, II, 124.

to the Dhimmis—to wit: Yuhannis ibn Yuḥanna ibn Dawūd, the Jacobite patriarch of the Christians⁹⁴ and his followers, Naṣr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Yuḥanna al-Bazzār⁹⁵ known as Al-Ḳummās,⁹⁶ Hibat Allāh ibn Yuḥanna ibn Abī al-Faraj, the scribe known as Ibn Ḳārūrāh, Faḍl Allāh ibn Hibat Allāh ibn Isrā'īl the scribe and Ishāk ibn Faḍā'il the scribe⁹⁷ known as al-Khursī,⁹⁸ as well as others whose names have not been mentioned in it. The whole of the decree which follows—reference to which is made above—and the testimony mentioned in it, were placed before our Lord and Master the Chief Cadi, the Shāfi'ite Sheikh al-Islām and our Lord and Master the Chief Cadi the Ḥanafite Sheikh al-Islām.

A request concerning the matter was brought before our Lord and Master the Chief Cadi, the Sheikh al-Islām al-Sa'dī al-'Abbāsī al-Dairī the Ḥanafite afore mentioned; the substance of which is—after the Basmallah and after the enumeration of those who are mentioned in it: that in every house of prayer existing in Cairo and Fuṣṭāṭ (May they be well guarded!⁹⁹) there were portions that had fallen into ruin. A general permission had been given . . . to restore that which had become ruined in every house of prayer and a decree to this effect had been written by . . . and given them signed by their lordships the chief Cadis, the Shāfi'ite and the Ḥanafite Sheikhs al-Islām. An order had come to the Chief Cadis, the Shāfi'ite and the Ḥanafite Sheikhs al-Islām to examine the matter. This was found to be well grounded in law. They asked also for an order that one of the judicial substitutes should examine the matter and see whether the repairs of the aforementioned place which had fallen into ruin had been made according to law and according to the decision of his court. The Mameluke 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ, Sheikh of the Karaite Jews and Ishāk, Ra'īs of the Karaite Jews¹⁰⁰ agreed to this restoration . . . according to the aforementioned account and the pact above mentioned, the legal ordinance above mentioned and the attested legal permission reference to which has been made above.

All this was read out in the hearing of our Lord and Master, the Chief Cadi, the Ḥanafite Sheikh al-Islām. He looked into the matter as well as

⁹⁴ This is evidently the Jacobite patriarch mentioned above, p. 369.

⁹⁵ البزار or البزار. See al-Dhahabī, *loc. cit.*, pp. 38, 39.

⁹⁶ I. e., the arch-priest. Lane, *Modern Egyptians* (1846, II, p. 317), punctuates قُبص and Sambari (fol. 135) writes قِيمُوْز.

⁹⁷ Text has الكاتب بالمعاص. Is this the name of a place or of an office?

⁹⁸ Al-Dhahabī, *loc. cit.*, p. 102.

⁹⁹ Van Berchem (*Revue africaine*, 1905, p. 175), has shown conclusively that this is the true rendering of the term.

¹⁰⁰ It is peculiar that we find here a Ra'īs for the Karaite Jews. In the documents and in the secretaries' manuals of the time, it is distinctly said that the Ra'īs of the Rabbinite Jews had jurisdiction over Rabbinites, Karaites and Samaritans, though a special form of commission to the Ra'īs of the Samaritans is also given. See *JQR.*, XIX, pp. 500 f.

into the presentment of our Lord and Master the Chief Cadi, the Sheikh al-Islām, the Ḥāfiẓ Shihāb al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās al-'Aṣkalānī, in which he confirmed the Dhimmis in the pact mentioned above, the explanation of which occurs in it. He was of opinion that the presentment of Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Aṣkalānī in regard to the aforementioned pact was a legal judgment. Al-Ḳinānī al-Bulḳinī agreed with him in this—that the permission which issued from the sultan, the ruler al-Malik al-Ashraf who is mentioned by name above is a legal document; and that the decision of the Mālikite Chief Cadi Badr al-Dīn al-Tinnisī in regard to the testimony of the Dhimmis whose names are above mentioned (the explanation of which is in the document) does not contradict the edict above mentioned nor the judgment of the Ḥanafite judge nor the work permitted to be done by his opinion.

He has signed¹⁰¹ the above account with his own hand, commissioning the Cadi Afḍal al-Dīn to consider the matter from the legal point of view, after having made a complete examination. This was put in the hands of Afḍal al-Dīn the Mufti, Abū al-Faḍl Maḥmūd ibn Sirāj al-Dīn, the Mufti, Abū Khafs Omar al-Ḳarmī,^{101a} the Ḥanafite the judicial substitute in Egypt. He attended to it at once; discussing the matter several times with his superior al-Sa'dī al-'Abbāsī al-Dairī the Ḥanafite. The latter ordered him to carry out the work in accordance with his decision and after the fullest investigation.

Then Afḍal al-Dīn, together with the judicial scribes who were to put their signatures to the document and the architects proficient in building and ordering, in putting up and tearing down and who had been invited to do this work by the Court, went to where the houses of prayer in al-Ḳāhirah and in Fustāṭ were which belonged to the Karaite Jews. One of them was the synagogue in al-Ḳāhirah inside the Ḥārat Zuwailah they studied it carefully and acquired a knowledge that removes ignorance a side destroyed by one of the mob, its length was three hundred cubits In its¹⁰² on the side already mentioned touching the west, are places which need examining for repairs below and above. On this side is a broken down wall, the bricks of which have fallen out in front and a side is destroyed before This needs repairing below and above. On the inside of the court of the synagogue is a vestibule, through which one reaches the gate of the synagogue. In it (the vestibule) is a wall, the top part of which has been destroyed, and its gate has been taken out. At present, the aforementioned gate is to be found in the synagogue. The wall needs

¹⁰¹ I do not understand the text, which seems to read: وتأخ; perhaps وتترج.

^{101a} Al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Ḥajar: Afḍal al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Sirāj al-Dīn 'Omar (ibn Manḡūr) al-Ḳarmī.

¹⁰² Text has وفي قبة. Is this قبة = قبة, Dozy, II, p. 402b?

repairing and the gate must be returned¹⁰³ Inside the synagogue is a ruined place, one side of which has been repaired round about to a height of eight cubits by six; this needs further repairing by building upward and downward. On the eastern side, within it (the synagogue) are damaged supports and a high roof. This needs repairing, and the roof surrounding it must be remade. One of its sides needs adjusting; and the supports on the western side down to the foundation need repairing with wood, before they fall to pieces and need to be entirely replaced. Inside (the synagogue) on its western side is a second ruin in which are repairs. In the front, near to the Kiblah¹⁰⁴ repairs have been made to the timber of the roof. This needs restoring and further repairing. Round about this court-yard, above its pillars of marble are ruined supports a small restoration near to which is a gate, the supports of which need restoring and rebuilding.

One goes through the aforementioned gate to a place in which there are three broken basins, needing repairing and restoration at the bottom and at the top. And in the passage-way leading from it to the synagogue, both sides—right and left—need repairing all around above and below. In the aforementioned passage is a staircase by means of which one mounts to the upper part of the synagogue; to the right and to the left as one goes up is the door of a private room,¹⁰⁵ the supports of which are in a broken condition. Opposite to it is a ruined wall resting upon a wooden foundation; this needs repairing. On the top part of the above-mentioned synagogue are overlaid woods and overlaid¹⁰⁶ resting upon wooden supports. These need repairing as well as the wood which is between the two roofs.

In the upper part near to on the eastern side and resting upon the wooden supports. These need renovating and restoring. On the aforementioned staircase at the top there are repairs. In this there is a crenelated parapet, which needs renovating and repairing below and above. On the upper story of the synagogue there is a damaged roof that needs repairing. In the upper story toward the east and on the side mentioned is a fallen wall. On the top are ruined layers¹⁰⁷ on the third

¹⁰³Text, من المتعرضين "by those who have caused the damage"? But it is expressly stated that the gate is in the synagogue, and therefore in the possession of the synagogue. The text is uncertain, as possibly there is a break between this word and the one preceding it. Perhaps, "by the mob," as I have translated the word above.

¹⁰⁴Evidently "the ark."

¹⁰⁵How is this possible, unless the door was so large as to have two wings?

¹⁰⁶Text has بتل?

¹⁰⁷طباق pl. of طبقة. The word must have some special meaning here which escapes me. Perhaps "rafters"?

story. These must be demolished and cleared of the rubbish in them in order to lighten the weight upon that which is below, and in order that the materials mentioned may be used for repairing whatsoever needs repairing.

The aforementioned synagogue is comprised within the following four bounds: The southern side borders on a waste place; the western side borders on a waste place also. On this side is the mosque mentioned above which needs repairing and renovating, as has also been aforementioned. The eastern side borders on a waste place. On this side is the gate to the synagogue aforementioned; and the gate of the court which is the property of the aforementioned synagogue called the *Kā'at al-Jaban*. The western side borders on a waste place; so that there is not near to this synagogue upon its four sides either building or dwelling-place. It stands today in the midst of waste places and of heaps of rubbish.

The result of the official examination here mentioned, together with what has been reported above, were verified before our Master *Afdal al-Dīn* in a lawful manner and with legal proof. The attestation of our Lord *Shihāb al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad* was attached to it in regard to his own person¹⁰⁸ in the matter of the proofs and the judgment in accordance with the warrant which issued from the Sultan¹⁰⁹ *al-Malik al-Ashraf*, according to the permission of the same referred to above. There was attached to it also the action taken by *Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Askalānī*, in regard to the aforementioned pact concerning the recognition by the *Dhimmis* of their duties and his confirming them in the privileges of the pact—in clear language and taking the place of a judgment, in accordance with the aforementioned permission, as has been stated above. There was attached to it also the judgment given by the *Mālikite* Chief *Cadi al-Badr ibn al-Zubair al-Tinnisī*, which is recorded upon the margin of the pact above mentioned, together with the obligation recorded in a special section upon the margin of the pact mentioned. All this was brought before him in a perfectly legal manner, to be respected, satisfactory and with full legal proofs.

He (*Afdal al-Dīn*) gave permission to repair what was needed in the above-mentioned places of worship according to the decision explained above, i. e., more specifically the two synagogues mentioned above—to do as much as is sufficient to carry this out. He forbade them to do more than this; both the permission and the inhibition being perfect in law, and after note had been taken of what had been done contrary to

¹⁰⁸ I. e., that he had taken the testimony.

¹⁰⁹ The title *Sultān* in Egypt seems first to have been adopted by *Saladin*—in full, *Sultān al-Islām w-al-Muslimīn*. It was commonly born by the *Mameluke* rulers, who had themselves invested by the shadowy caliph whom they kept near to them for that purpose. See *Van Berchem, Corpus*, pp. 261, 767.

this.¹¹⁰ He had his decision attested by witnesses, as well as the fact that both the permission and the inhibition explained above took the place of a judgment, together with the note of what had been done contrary to this, as this is explained in the document relating to the inquest which is dated Ramaḍān 27, 859, done in the handwriting of our Lord, the learned judge above mentioned, completed by the signatures of those who had been present at the aforementioned inquest in company of the judge aforementioned—signatories and architects.

This having happened and a long period having elapsed, displeasure having manifested itself against the Dhimmis because they had built their places of prayer and their convents in Fustāt, contravening the law in this, the matter was brought to the attention of our Lord the Sultan Malik al-Ashraf. He ordered the convening of a Majlis in his own presence. Such a Majlis was convened in his presence, consisting of the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām of the four rites. There was much discussion and controversy between those present at the Majlis in regard to the above-mentioned pact, and in regard to the decision of the Mālikite Cadi Badr al-Dīn Abū al-Akhlās Muḥammad ibn Zubair al-Tinnīsī. The order was given to the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām, to betake themselves to the houses of prayer mentioned.

An order came from the Sultan^{110a} to the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām, to go upon an appointed day to Fustāt to examine the places of worship. Then the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām of the four rites, to wit: The Sheikh al-Islām Abū al-Thiḡah Ṣāliḥ al-Kinānī al-Bulḡinī al-Shāfi'i, the Sheikh al-Islām al-Sa'd ibn 'Abbās al-Dairī al-Ḥanafī, the Sheikh al-Islām Abū al-Bakā Muḥammad al-Ḳurashī al-Amawī¹¹¹ al-Mālikī, Abū al-Barakāt Aḥmad al-Kinānī al-Ḥanafī, the procurators of justice in Egypt and in the rest of the Islamic countries; together with Abū Zakariyya Yahya al-'Aḳsarā'i al-Ḥanafī, and all the honorable judicial substitutes in al-Ḳāhirah and Fustāt (May the two be well guarded!) went and an examination was made of the places of worship existing in Fustāt. One of these was the Jewish synagogue in the Khaṭṭ al-Muṣāṣah¹¹² in the ruins of Fustāt. The inquest was made in the presence of the Sheikh al-Aḳsarā'i al-Ḥanafī mentioned above, and a number of the judicial substitutes among whom was the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn the Ḥanafite judge aforementioned, a number of judicial scribes, a number

¹¹⁰ I am not certain of this translation. **عالم بخلاف من ذلك** may be simply a legal formula: "Knowing the consequences of contravening this order."

^{110a} The addition of the words, **شرفه الله وعظمه**, shows that reference is here to an order from the Sultan. Cf. Van Berchem, *Corpus*, p. 135.

¹¹¹ Or al-Umawī; al-Dhahabī, *loc. cit.*, p. 15; Ibn Khaṭīb al-Dahsha, *Tuḥfah Dhawī-l-'Arab*, ed. T. Mann, p. 137.

¹¹² On this synagogue see my remarks in *JQR.*, XIX, p. 505.

of Muḥammadans and a number of architects, to wit: the Master 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sutūh, the Master Khalil ibn Ibrāhīm known as Ibn Bashshār, the Master Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh known as Akrūt,^{112a} the Master Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad known as Ibn al-Fākhūrī. These made a complete examination. They found there what had been restored in accordance with the permission given for such restoration in the permit which had issued from the Sheikh Abū al-Faḍl Maḥmūd al-Karmī al-Ḥanafī, the judge already mentioned, enabling them to make such restoration; as well as that which had been restored in excess of this and to which the permit did not attach. Imagining that the permit was a general one, while it was only specific, they had built in the house of prayer in Fustāṭ in the churches belonging to the Christians both what the permit allowed, as well as what had not been allowed.

Thereupon the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām, together with our Lord the Sheikh Amīn al-Dīn al-Aḳṣarā'ī al-Ḥanafī returned to our Master, the ruler al-Malik al-Ashraf, and informed him of what had been found in the religious edifices known as the Christian churches already mentioned; both the excess of repair that had been undertaken in some of the churches of the Christians, and that which had been done in them in accordance with the permission to repair. They also reported that in the synagogues of the Jews in Fustāṭ nothing had been done more than had been permitted; with the exception that in the synagogue known as the Muṣāṣah Synagogue, which was in the ruined part of Fustāṭ and which belonged to the Jews, there had been found some building material—clay, lime, sand and wood—thrown upon the ground inside the building for making the repairs permitted in it.

Whereupon our Master the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf published an edict that a second examination should be made; that whatsoever had been done in excess of the repairs permitted should be removed, but that which had been done in accordance with the permission to repair should remain untouched; and that in regard to the whole matter a legal judgment should be rendered.

Then the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām mentioned above, together with our Lord the Sheikh Amīn al-Dīn al-Aḳṣarā'ī al-Ḥanafī, and al-'Ālī' al-Kabīrī al-'Aḳudī¹¹³ al-Nāṣirī al-Saifi al-Ḥājib¹¹⁴ Amīr of al-Malik al-Ashraf and al-'Ālī al-Amīrī al-Kabīrī al-'Aḳudī al-Nāṣirī al-Saifi¹¹⁵

^{112a} A peculiar designation; عكروت is used in Turkish for our "son of a gun"!!

¹¹³ I. e., 'aḳud al-daulah or 'aḳud amīr al-Mu'minīn. On al-Aḳṣarā'ī see Siyūṭī, *Ḥusn*, I, 227.

¹¹⁴ The real name seems to be omitted; all the terms used are mere titles. He must have had some official position, as he is called "Amīr of al-Ashraf." The title al-Ḥājibī (= al-Ḥājib?) the chamberlain is also evidence of this. See Blochet in *Rev. l'or. Latin.*, IX, p. 90.

¹¹⁵ All these relative adjectives are taken presumably from those born by the sultan in whose services these men were, Mālik Ashraf Ināl, Al-Nāṣirī=Abū al-Naṣr on the inscrip-

Tagri Bardī al-Bardabakī,¹¹⁶ al-Ḥājibī, and many of those attached to the Court in al-Ḳāhirah and Fustāṭ, among whom was the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn, went to Fustāṭ to examine a second time the places of worship mentioned there. A complete examination was made in the presence of the Sheikh Amīn al-Dīn al-Aḳṣarā'i and of the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn, of many of the Court procurators and the chamberlains^{116a} mentioned above, the Court attendants, the architects and a number of Muḥammadans. In consequence, there was pulled down in the churches belonging to the Christians whatsoever had been done in excess of the work permitted: namely, they had built in the church known as Abū Jurj¹¹⁷ supports, and an arch had been built, instead of the sides the repair of which had been permitted. The head of that church Michael ibn Sergius made the request that this be permitted. But the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn, the senior judge mentioned in the above-cited writ, ordered the Christians aforementioned to be beaten severely and painfully in the presence of the Amīr Ḥājibs. He was beaten severely and painfully, and in a state of nudity, as a reprimand to himself and to those who were like him. He was carried around the streets as a criminal, and clapped into the Dailam prison¹¹⁸ in al-Ḳāhirah for some days, as a punishment for that which had been reported about him in connection with the building that went beyond the permission and beyond the writ of the judge aforementioned, and because of the permission that he had given to those who had wrongly done this.

Some of those who had been present at the examination wished that all that had been repaired in the places of worship mentioned should be destroyed; basing this wish upon the testimony given in reference to the Dhimmis—i. e., Yuhannis and his followers—mentioned in that part of the testimony which is written upon the margin of the copy of the pact which issued in the days of the Zāhirite dynasty, the first part of which testimony was dated Ramaḍān 19, 840, and the last part of which was dated Shawwāl 6 of the aforementioned year 846. It contained the testimony indicated above written on the margin of the pact, the testimony of Yuhannis the Patriarch and his followers, as well as that of others whose names are not mentioned, which was to wit: that he put constraint upon himself in a manner legally binding not to restore anything in his

tion in the Madrasah (Van Berchem, *Corpus*, p. 402). Al-'Alī ought perhaps to be al-'Alā'i, if it is not merely another form of derivative from the proper name 'Alī. See especially his titles in the inscription on his mausoleum, *ibid.*, p. 395.

¹¹⁶ The whole name is unpointed in the text. I take the word, **البردنبكى**, to be a *nisbah* of Bardabak. (See index to Ibn Iyās, *Ta'rikh Miṣr*, p. 21.)

^{116a} On the functions of the **حاجب الديوان** see al-Ḳalkāshandī, *Subḥ al-ʿashā*, Cairo, 1903, I, p. 85.

¹¹⁷ I. e., of Saint George; *al-Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 511 below; Wāstenfeld, *Copten*, p. 119.

¹¹⁸ Perhaps in the Dailam street. See de Sacy, *Chrestomatie arabe*, I, p. 103.

own church nor in a monastery nor in a cloister, nor in a cell, nor in a chapel in the lands belonging to the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir, nor through any one who should ask his assistance in such or in similar building operations; that whatsoever had become ruined or damaged of its walls and its beams, etc., in its ancient¹¹⁹ or otherwise, should not be repaired; that he would not give wine to Moslems either by selling it or in any other fashion whatsoever, nor would he cause a Moslem to drink it. Should he contravene this or any part of it, or go beyond it or any part of it, his punishment should be that the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir should destroy all the churches, monasteries, cloisters, cells, and chapels in which such had been done; and that the Sultan mentioned above should act as he pleased in this matter. He accepted this as an obligation for his own person; annexing it to the conditions aforementioned to which he had bound himself previous to this, which are explained in the copy of the aforesaid pact, made in the days of the Zāhirite dynasty according to his own request and for his own satisfaction; because he recognized that it would benefit and aid himself, Islām, and the Muḥammadans, and after each party had understood the meaning of this agreement, and the additions that had been made in a legal manner and relying upon the responsum given by Badr al-Dīn Abū al-Akhlās Muḥammad al-Zubairī al-Tinnisī the Mālikite Chief Cadi relying upon all those mentioned above who had testified according to the personal testimony which each one had given for himself—a legal decision, asked for, fulfilling the legal provisions, in a case brought against them by a plaintiff whose case can be accepted; and after evidence had been given by him to the issue thereof, and he had been summoned to a sitting of the court aforementioned in clear language and in other ways compelling his attention, and after he had become acquainted with the consequences of contravening this, and with the fact that this pact prohibited the repairs of the religious edifices mentioned therein and in others, necessitating the demolition of the religious edifices mentioned.

A discussion was raised whether the demolition should be partial or complete; and if the judgment were that it must be partial, nothing should be done contrary to what the judgment calls for; also if any one, whosoever he might be, should take a lease of the ruins of a place of worship which was not his property, would such a lease be sound? The Court busied itself with this question and when rendering a decision heard the report of those who had been present in the committee of inquest mentioned in¹²⁰ a part of the testimony; heard also its decision in the matter and the examination to which attention has been called and noted in the decision of Mālikite judges. The question was asked, does the judgment

¹¹⁹Text بالالات القديمة?

¹²⁰The word في seems to have dropped out.

mentioned touch anyone who has not been actually summoned to appear in the matter?

Our Lord the Chief Cadi, the Sheikh al-Islām al-Sa'dī al-Badrī al-Ḥanafī took into consideration that which had issued from his substitute Afḍal al-Dīn in regard to the inquest mentioned. He found it to accord with the principles of his own rite, which stipulates that the Dhimmis might repair that which was ruined of their houses of prayer and their monasteries; that it agreed with that which had been assured to them by our Lord the Chief Cadi Sheikh al-Islām the Ḥāfiẓ al-Shihābī al-Shāfi'ī, in the pact which he had written with the Dhimmis in the days of the Zāhirite dynasty according to the order of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir; and because, also, it agreed with the legal opinion in regard to the renewal of the pact with those of the Dhimmis who have been named; and further, because it agreed with the pact of Omar taken as authority for the case of the Dhimmis in the days of al-Ṣalāḥ¹²¹ and in the days of al-Nāṣir.¹²²

He opined that the action taken in this matter during the last eight hundred years, without any question having been raised as to its change, was the action that ought to be taken in this case; and that the judgment of our Lord the Chief Cadi al-Badrī al-Tinnīsī the Mālikite, together with the obligation which had issued in the Zāhirite dynasty, did not contravene the permission given by the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Abū Naṣr Īnāl, as mentioned above, nor the judgment rendered by the Ḥanafite judge which permitted repairs to be made in the old places of worship, and which allowed that which had been repaired in them to be preserved. This is what ought to be done in this case.

Afḍal al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl Maḥmūd al-Karmī, the Ḥanafite judge, then intrusted to us to deal with the Dhimmis in the matter of their houses of prayer, their monasteries, their cells, and their dwellings in conformity with the decision of the law and according to the precepts of his court and to issue a writ in the matter in accordance with the precept of his rite.

Thereupon our Master Afḍal al-Dīn went to where the above-mentioned places of prayer were, together with those of the court scribes whose duty it was to affix their signatures to the document dealing with the matter; also with the Master Sammāl Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad the architect known as al-Ḳarāfi,¹²³ the Master Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, the architect known as Ibn al-Fākhūrī¹²⁴—architects of al-Ḳāhirah. They went to the place where stood the synagogue in the Ḥārat Zuwailah belonging to the Karaite Jews within the Karaite quarter

¹²¹ Does this refer to the proceedings of the year 755 A. H. (1354 A. D.) mentioned above p. 367? If so, it ought to come after the following.

¹²² I. e., Nāṣir ibn Ḳalā'ūn. See above p. 367.

¹²³ So called from one of the Kbiṭṭāhs in Fuṣṭāṭ, *Yāqūt*, IV, p. 48, *JAOS.*, XXVII, p. 233.

¹²⁴ He was present at the first inquest.

of al-Ḳāhirah mentioned.¹²⁵ It was found, both according to the previous and the present description, to have been repaired according to the terms regarding it granted by the Ḥanafite judge who had been delegated for this purpose by his chief; as has been explained in the legal permit referred to above, and without anything beyond what the permit called for having been done.

The foregoing was attested before our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn in a legal manner with legal proofs witnessing to it and referring specifically to it. Whereupon the one whose right it was by law to make the request, i. e., 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ, Sheikh of the Karaite Jews, the relator above mentioned, asked our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn the Ḥanafite judge to respect that which had been repaired in the synagogue aforementioned according to the permission and the writ explained above, to prevent any opposition to this, as well as to permit the remaining repairs to be made which had been allowed in the religious building mentioned above, and finally to have his document properly witnessed to.

Our Lord the Judge asked the blessing of God, answered the questioner, and gave in the matter asked for a just, legal, complete and satisfactory judgment as demanded—its conditions satisfying the law and with a full cognizance of the dissenting opinion.¹²⁶ He had his answer witnessed to. Then the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn, the Ḥanafite judge, returned to his chief our Lord the Chief Cadi al-Sa'dī al-'Abbāsī al-Dairī al-Ḥanafī, in order to transmit to him the judgment of the Sheikh Shihāb al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Burḥī¹²⁷ al-Shāfi'ī, the legal deputy in Egypt, according to the testimony dealing with the permission given by the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf; and in order to transmit the judgment arrived at by the regretted Chief Cadi Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Asḳālānī al-Shāfi'ī, in the form of a patent which is equivalent to the judgment, recorded in the pact mentioned above, the wording of which is specifically affixed to it. He recalled the terms laid down for them and against them—the text of the demand made by the Dhimmis being:

“We ask your protection for ourselves, our posterity, our possessions and our coreligionists. We covenant to you as regards our own persons, that we will not build in our city nor in its neighborhood any convent, church, cell, or hut for a monk nor will we rebuild them should they fall into ruin. We will not replace that which has been demolished in the quarters where Muḥammadans live. We will not prevent any Muḥammadans from entering our places of prayer or our convents by night or by day. We will open our doors for those that pass by and for the traveler. If a Muḥammadan traveler should take refuge in them we will

¹²⁵ This may be on the same site on which the present Karaite synagogue stands; though the Ḥārāt Zuwailah is applied to a more restricted area than it was then. See *JQR.*, XIX, p. 520.

¹²⁶ A similar phrase to the one used above.

¹²⁷ Or al-Baraḥī; see al-Dhahabī, *loc. cit.*, p. 32.

feed him as a guest for three nights.¹²⁸ We will not teach our children the Koran. We will not openly vaunt our religion, nor try to convert any one to it. We will not seek to prevent any of our relatives from accepting Islām, if he should wish. We will show respect for Muḥammadans. We will rise up from our seats when one of their prominent men wishes to sit down.¹²⁹ We will not copy them in their manner of riding and addressing — not even in their head-gear,¹³⁰ their sandals, or in their way of parting the hair. We will not use their peculiar expressions of speech nor their surnames. We will not ride upon saddles, nor gird on swords, neither possess nor carry any weapons. We will not engrave in Arabic upon our seals. We will not further the sale of wine. We will shave the front part of our heads. Wherever we may be we will put a restraint upon ourselves. We will tighten the girdles about our loins.¹³¹ We will not exhibit our crosses and our holy books in any assembly¹³² of Muḥammadans, in their public places, or in their streets. We will not raise our voices while reading in our place of worship or elsewhere when Muḥammadans are present. We will not go out in companies upon Palm Sunday nor on other festivals.¹³³ We will not raise our voices in bewailing our dead, nor carry lights when accompanying them either in the streets where Muḥammadans live or in their places. We will not bury our dead near to theirs. We will not take as slaves any that have fallen by lot to the Muḥammadans nor look upon them from our dwellings.¹³⁴ We will not strike a

¹²⁸ The text in *Sirāj al-Mulūk* and in the *Kanz al-'Ummāl* (see, also, Arnold) adds here: "We will not harbor in our churches or our dwellings a robber, or conceal any enemy of the Muḥammadans."

¹²⁹ *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, Hamaker "We will rise up for them (ﻗﻪ in place of 'their prominent men'), when they wish to sit down."

¹³⁰ The other texts have "in their dress, either in the cap, turban, etc."

¹³¹ Some texts add, "We will not show the cross upon our churches, and only strike the bells in our churches lightly."

¹³² The other texts, "in the streets of the Muḥammadans or in their market-places."

¹³³ Other texts, "we will not carry palm-branches or our images in procession."

¹³⁴ Other texts, "nor spy into their houses." After this, Hamaker, *Sirāj* and *Kanz al-'Ummāl* and al-Siyūṭī: "Now when I brought this letter to Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, he added to it "And we will not strike any Muḥammadan." The following clause is entirely omitted. Whether these omissions are due entirely to the scribe, or whether certain modifications were made in the original, it is impossible to decide. The earlier literature upon the "Pact" will be found in Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Litteratur*, pp. 165 ff. I have also consulted the text published by H. A. Hamaker in his notes to *Incerti auctoris liber de Expugnatione Memphitis et Alexandriae*, Leyden, 1:25, p. 165; Muḥammad ibn Walid al-Turṭūshī, *Sirāj al-Mulūk*, Cairo, 1319, p. 118; al-Siyūṭī, *Kanz al-'Ummāl* on the margin of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad*, II, p. 310. Aḥmad al-Abshahī, *Kitāb al-Mustaṭraf*, I, 103. A translation of Hamaker's text is given in T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam*, p. 52; of the text according to Ibn Khaldūn and others by Amari, *Histoire des Musulmans de la Sicile*, p. 477; of the text of Ibn Asākir by Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Islams*, I, p. 102. The text in Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Siyūṭī's *Iḥāf al-akhissā*, is translated in James Reynolds, *The History of the Temple of Jerusalem*, London, 1836, but in a faulty manner (see Guy le Strange in *JRAS.*, XIX, p. 247). The pact is also quoted with many explanations by Joseph ibn Isaac Sambari in his "Chronicle" (MS Alliance Isr. Universelle, Paris, pp. 12 ff.; omitted in Neubauer's ed., *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, I).

Muḥammadan nor curse him. We will not buy anything from the captives of the Muḥammadans. We covenant this for our own persons and for our coreligionists. In exchange, we receive security that you will grant us the protection of Allāh and the protection of the Muḥammadans; that no one will be forced to do that which he is unable to fulfil, nor what is beyond that which is specified; that no one of us shall be wronged in his person, his family, his children, his followers, his possessions or in any of our places of worship. Should any one of us be wronged, it is the duty of the Muḥammadans to repel such wrong and to punish the evil-doers. Should any one of us violate this pact, he shall forfeit protection and pact; and you are permitted to treat him as enemies and rebels are treated."

The chief of the Dhimmis whose names are aforementioned to wit: Yuhannis and his council mentioned above, Philoteus, Patriarch of the Malkite Christians; 'Abd al-Laṭīf ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Shams, Ra'īs of the Rabbinite Jews; Faraj Allāh ibn Mūsa, one of the Sheikhs of the Karaite Jews; and Ibrāhīm ibn Salāmah ibn Ibrāhīm, chief of the Samaritans, asked the Chief Cadi al-Ḥāfiẓ Shihāb al-Dīn-'Asḳalānī the Shāfi'ite to confirm them in the conditions mentioned above which they accepted for themselves, and the provisions of which they engaged themselves to observe.

Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Asḳalānī the Shāfi'ite answered their questions saying distinctly "I confirm you in the right to dwell in any country of Islām except the Ḥijāz and to journey through it except holy Mecca, in accordance with these conditions, if you pay the capitulation tax according to established custom." In the *ensemble* of what is written in the copy of the pact above mentioned are some things that need explanation and specification, e. g., that the meaning of the word "renewing" in a city in which their residence is established, is to be taken in a general sense as comprising both small and large cities; and the meaning of "if any part of them should become ruined" is that if the place of worship should become ruined, it may not be renewed, only that when its wall is damaged, no prohibition shall stand against repairing that wall together with what is below it." The Chief Cadi, the Sheikh al-Islām al-Sa'dī al-Badri al-Ḥanafī, granted the request asked for in regard to the execution of the document.

Then our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn invoked the aid of God, and took as witnesses for himself those that had been present at his court and at his decision—he being the one to carry out the judgment and the decision and to render them. On the ninth day of Ṣafar 860 (May it come to an end with goodness and victory!) he proclaimed the judgment of our Lord Shihāb al-Dīn abū 'Abbās Aḥmad al-Burḥī the Shāfi'ite judge, given in the document mentioned above, the date of which is also given above. He proclaimed also the confirmation which

is equal to a judgment of the Chief Cadi Shihāb al-Dīn al-'Asḳalānī al-Shāfi'ī, and given in the copy of the pact mentioned above—a perfectly legal proclamation, complete, accredited, acceptable, demanded, its legal provisions being adequate. This he authorized and ratified and commanded that it should be carried out. He had witnesses countersign it, on the date mentioned above, written by his own hand. Praise be to God first and last!

In it is the addition¹³⁵ Sa'ala-wafihī su'āl ahl-il-dhimmati fihī and the correction māni'an al-taḥarri biman'i ikhdār dhawū to the phrase hā māni'an. In the addition are the words binā'un saḥḥihun. All these changes have been made in their proper place. God is sufficient and a pleasant advocate!

Has taken us as witness our Lord and Master, the servant longing for God the most high, the Sheikh, the Imām, the wise, the energetic, the wonderful, the pontiff, the munificent, the learned, the intelligent, the erudite, the devout, the pious, the saintly,¹³⁶ Sa'd al-Ḥanafī, for his own person as far as concerned that part of the aforementioned that has reference to himself, as well as for his judicial substitute our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl Maḥmūd al-Karmī al-Ḥanafī, as far as concerns that part of the aforementioned having reference to him. I was present at the inquest made of the religious edifices mentioned above, together with those designated above on the various occasions as is explained above. Signed Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Jabarī al-Shāfi'ī.

Has taken us as a witness our Lord the Chief Cadi Sa'd ibn al-'Abbās al-Dairī al-Ḥanafī in respect of his own person in regard to that which has reference to himself above. I witness to it for him and for his substitute our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn, in regard to that which has reference to him. I was present at the examination of the churches belonging to the Jacobite Christians which were in Fustāt (May it be well guarded!) i. e., the last examination—with the exception of the Mu'allakah church¹³⁷ and the church of Abū Sarjah¹³⁸ and the church St. Barbara,¹³⁹ as is explained above. Signed: Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Nabih. He has told me this in the terms used by a witness.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁵ These last sections call attention to certain additions made to the document after it had been written. They had also to be attested. The same practice was common in writing Hebrew documents; cf. R. Gottheil, "Some Spanish Documents," in *JQR.*, XVI, p. 704, note 5. On the word, ملك, in this sense, see de Sacy in *Notices et extraits*, XI, p. 17, 4.

¹³⁶ Probably for the fuller حجة الاسلام والمسلمين, Van Berchem, *Corpus*, p. 97. See also de Slane, *Ibn Khallikan*, I, p. 587, for the explanation.

¹³⁷ In the Kaṣar al-Sham'. Wüstenfeld, *Copten*, p. 119; Butler, *Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, p. 216.

¹³⁸ St. Sergius; Wüstenfeld, *loc. cit.*, p. 120.

¹³⁹ Near Abū Sarjah, *ibid.*; Butler, *loc. cit.*, p. 181.

¹⁴⁰ Evidently, the witness was unable to sign his own name.

Has taken me as a witness the Chief Cadi Sa'd Badr al-Dīn al-Ḥanafī for his own person. I witness for him in regard to that which has reference to him; also for his judicial substitute our Lord the Sheikh Afḍal al-Dīn al-Karmī in regard to that which has reference to him. I was present at the examination of the above-mentioned places of worship together with those mentioned above at the various times. Signed:¹⁴¹

Afḍal al-Dīn has taken me as a witness for his own person in regard to that which in the above has reference to him. I so witness. Signed: Aḥmad.

Praise be to God! I testify for Sammāl Muḥammad ibn Sammāl Muḥammad ibn Khalf, the architect known as al-Ḳarāfī, in a legal manner, that he examined the churches mentioned above at the last building inquest mentioned above . . . : as is related . . . above.

Khalil ibn 'Alī, the architect known as ibn Bashshār, testified to the inquest mentioned as related above.

'Alī ibn Aḥmad known as ibn Sutūḥ testified to the inquest mentioned as related above.

I was present at the inquest mentioned in the service of the Chief Cadis, the Sheikhs al-Islām mentioned above, the matter passing off as related above, and together with our Master Afḍal al-Dīn at the second and the last inquest as is related above. Signed: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, architect, known as al-Fākhūrī.

IV

.....
بما يقتضيه الشرع الشريف على مذهب من يرفع به منها.
وذلك ان تاشر حسبما شرح ذلك في بالثاني والعشرين
من ذى الحجة سنة ثمان وخمسين وثمانائة.

5 وعرض الاشهاد المشار اليه على سيدنا ومولانا شيخ الاسلام
العلمي الكناي البلقيني الشافعي المشار اليه باعالية ادام الله
تعالى ايامه وعزه وانعامه وعينه على نائبه في الحكم العزيز سيدنا
العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ الامام العالم العلامة شهاب

¹⁴¹ The signature is wanting.

الدين شرف العلماء اوجد الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين ابي العباس
احمد العسقلاني الشافعي خليفة الحكم العزيز بالديار المصرية
أيّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن فيه عنده انجح الله
تعالى قصده.

- 5 وثبت مضمونه لديه احسن الله تعالى اليه الثبوت الشرعي
وحكم أيّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه بموجب ذلك حكما
شرعيا حسبما دلّ على ذلك اجماله المسطر بظاهر الاشهاد المشار
اليه المؤرخ بخطه الكبير بالربع من صفر المبارك سنة تاريخه.
وأحضر لسيّدنا ومولانا قاضي القضاة شيخ الاسلام ملك العلماء
10 الاعلام العلمي الكنانّي البلقيني الشافعي وليّدنا ومولانا قاضي
القضاة شيخ الاسلام السعدي العبسي الديري الحنفي المشار
اليهما اعلاه ادام الله تعالى ايامهما واعزّ اوقاتهما واحسن اليهما
واسبع نعمه في الدارين عليهما العهد الشريف الذي جُدّد على
اهل الذمّة في الدولة الشريفة الظاهرية الآتي شرح مقاصده فيه.
15 وتامله كلّ منهما التامل الشافي وما سطر بهامشه ممّا نسب
لسيّدنا ومولانا قاضي القضاة بدر الدين قاضي المسلمين خالصة
امير المومنين ابي الاخلاص محمد الزبيري التنسي المالكي الناظر
في الاحكام الشرعية بالديار المصرية وسائر الممالك الشريفة
الاسلامية كان تغمّده الله تعالى بالرحمة والرضوان وما تضمّنه
20 الفصل المسطر بهامش نسخة العهد المشار اليه فيه ممّا نسب
لسيّدنا ومولانا قاضي القضاة البدري التنسي المالكي المشار اليه

تَعْبُدُهُ اللّٰهَ تَعَالَى بِرَحْمَتِهِ مِنَ الْحُكْمِ الْآتَى شَرْحَهُ وَالْأَشْهَادَ عَلَى
 أَهْلِ الذِّمَّةِ وَهُمْ يُوَثِّسُ بْنُ يُوْحَنَّا بْنُ دَاوُدَ بِطَرِيرِكَ النَّصَارَى
 الْيَعْقُوبِيَّةِ كَانَ وَجَاعَتُهُ نَصَرَ اللّٰهَ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ بْنُ يُوْحَنَّا الْبَزَّازِ كَانَ
 الْمَعْرُوفَ بِالْقُبُصِ وَهَبَةُ اللّٰهَ بْنُ يُوْحَنَّا بْنُ أَبِي الْفَرَجِ الْكَاتِبَ
 5 عَرَفَ بِأَبْنِ قَارُورَةَ وَفَضْلُ اللّٰهَ بْنُ هَبَةُ اللّٰهَ بْنُ إِسْرَائِيلَ الْكَاتِبَ
 كَانَ وَاسْخَافَ بْنَ فُضَائِلَ الْكَاتِبَ بِالْمَعَاصِرِ الْمَعْرُوفَ بِالْخُرْسَى
 وَغَيْرُهُمْ مِمَّا لَمْ يَسَمَّ فِيهِ.

وَعَرَضَ كُلٌّ مِنَ الْمَرْسُومِ الشَّرِيفِ الْمُنْتَعِ الْمَشَارِ إِلَيْهِ بِأَعَالِيَةِ
 وَالْأَشْهَادِ الشَّرِيفِ الْمَذْكُورِ فِيهِ عَلَى كُلِّ مَنْ سَيِّدْنَا وَمَوْلَانَا قَاضِي
 10 الْقَضَاةِ شَيْخُ الْإِسْلَامِ الشَّافِعِيِّ وَسَيِّدْنَا وَمَوْلَانَا قَاضِي الْقَضَاةِ شَيْخُ
 الْإِسْلَامِ الْحَنْفِيُّ الْمَشَارِ إِلَيْهِمَا فِيهِ أَدَامَ اللّٰهُ تَعَالَى أَيَّامَهُمَا وَاعَزَّ
 أَحْكَامَهُمَا وَاسْبَغَ فَضْلَهُ وَانْعَامَهُ عَلَيْهِمَا. وَرَفَعَتْ قِصَّةٌ بِسَبَبِ ذَلِكَ
 لِسَيِّدْنَا وَمَوْلَانَا قَاضِي الْقَضَاةِ شَيْخُ الْإِسْلَامِ السَّعْدِيُّ الْعَبْسِيُّ
 الدِّيَرِيُّ الْحَنْفِيُّ الْمَشَارِ إِلَيْهِ بِأَعَالِيَةِ أَدَامَ اللّٰهُ تَعَالَى مُعَالِيَةَ النَّبِيِّ
 15 مَضْمُونُهَا بَعْدَ الْبَسْمَلَةِ الشَّرِيفَةِ أَنْهَاءً مِنْ يَذْكُرُ فِيهِ أَنَّ بَكَنَائِسَهُمْ
 الْكَائِنَةَ بِالْقَاهِرَةِ وَمِصْرَ الْحُرُوسَتَيْنِ أَمَاكُنَ تَهْدَمَتْ وَقَدْ
 شَمِلَتْهُمْ بِأَعَادَةِ مَا تَهْدَمَ مِنْ كَنَائِسِهِمْ. وَكُتِبَ لَهُمْ بِذَلِكَ
 شَرِيفٌ وَشَمِلَ بِحُطِّ السَّادَةِ الْمَوَالِي قَضَاةَ الْقَضَاةِ مَشَائِخَ
 الْإِسْلَامِ الشَّافِعِيِّ وَالْحَنْفِيِّ وَحَصَلَ أذنُ شَرِيفٍ لِلْسَّادَةِ الْمَوَالِي قَضَاةَ
 20 الْقَضَاةِ مَشَائِخَ الْإِسْلَامِ الشَّافِعِيِّ وَالْحَنْفِيِّ بِالنَّظَرِ فِي ذَلِكَ. وَثَبَتَ
 ذَلِكَ فِي الشَّرْعِ الشَّرِيفِ وَسَأَلُوا فِيهَا الْأذنَ الشَّرِيفَ لِأَحَدِ نَوَابِ

الحكم العزيز بالنظر في ذلك واعادة ما تهدم من الاماكن المذكورة على الوجه الشرعى على مقتضى مذهب الشريف اجدوا بذلك الاعادة وبذيلها المملوك عبد الحق شيخ طائفة اليهود القرائين وامنحاف رئيس اليهود القرائين القصة المذكورة العهد المذكور اعلاه والمرسوم الشرعى الشريف المشار اليه باعالية 5 والاذن الشريف الثابت بالحكوم به المنبه عليه اعلاه.

وقرى ذلك على مسامع سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام الحنفى المشار اليه اعلاه ادام الله تعالى ايامه وعلاه. وتامل ذلك وما صدر من سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ 10 الاسلام الحافظ شهاب الدين قاضى المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابى العباس احمد العسقلانى الشافعى الناظر فى الاحكام الشرعية بالديار المصرية وسائر الممالك الشريفة الاسلامية كان تغمده الله تعالى بالرحمة والرضوان مما اقر اهل الذمة عليه فى العهد المذكور اعلاه الآتى بيانه فيه. ورأى ادام الله تعالى 15 ايامه واسبغ عليه فضله وانعامه ان ما صدر من مولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام الشهابى العسقلانى الشافعى المشار اليه فيه تنمده الله تعالى برحمته فى العهد المذكور حكم شرعى ووافقه على ذلك سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام ملك الاعلام العلمى الكنانى البلقينى الشافعى المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله 20 تعالى ايامه الزاهرة وجمع له بين خيرى الدنيا والآخرة. وان الاذن الشريف الصادر من مولانا السلطان المالك الملك الاشرف

المنوّه باسمه الشريف اعلاه نصره الله تعالى نصرا عزيزا وفتح له
 فتحا مبينا المنبّه عليه باعالية معتبر شرعا. وانّ حكم سيّدنا
 ومولانا قاضى القضاة البدرى التنسى المالكى المشار اليه باعالية
 تغفده الله تعالى برحمته بالاشهاد على اهل الذمّة المذكورة
 5 اسماؤهم اعلاه الآتى شرحه فيه ليس هو مانعا من الاذن الشريف
 المشار اليه اعلاه ولا من حكم الحاكم الحنفى ولا من العمل بما
 يقتضيه مذهب الشريف في ذلك.

وتوجّ القصة المذكورة اعلاه بخطّه العالى اعلاه الله تعالى بما
 مثاله القاضى افضل الدين اعزّه الله تعالى بنظر في ذلك على الوجه
 10 الشرعى بعد الكشف التام. وعرض ذلك على سيّدنا العبد الفقير
 الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين شرف العلماء اوحد الفضلاء
 مفتى المسلمين ابى الفضل محمود بن سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى
 الله تعالى الشيخ الامام العالم العلامة سراج الدين شرف العلماء
 اوحد الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين ابى حفص عمر القرمى الحنفى
 15 خليفة الحكم العزيز بالديار المصرية ايد الله تعالى احكامه
 واحسن اليه وامتنل ذلك بالسمع والطاعة وراجع مُسْتَنَبِه سيّدنا
 ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام السعدى العيسى الديرى الحنفى
 الناظر في الاحكام الشرعية بالديار المصرية المشار اليه باعالية
 ادام الله تعالى ايامه واسبع عليه فضله وانعامه واعلا معاليه في
 20 ذلك المرّة والمرتين.

وغوّس له العمل في ذلك بما يقتضيه مذهب الشريف بعد

الكشف الشافى. فتوجه سيدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ
افضل الدين الحاكم المشار اليه ايد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن
اليه ومحبتته من يضع خطه فيه من موثقى الحكم العزيز اجله
الله تعالى وادام بركة متولييه وايامه والمهندسين ارباب الخبرة
5 بالعقارات وعيوبها والبنية واحلالها المندوبين لذلك من مجلس
الحكم العزيز بالديار المصرية اجله الله تعالى الى حيث الكنائس
الكائنة بالقاهرة ومصر المحروستين المنسوبين لليهود القرائين
ومنها الكنيسة الكائنة بالقاهرة المحروسة داخل حارة زويلة
..... احاطوا بها علما وخبرة
10 نافية للجهالة ... جنب هدم باليد من المتعرضين طوله ثلاثة
اذرع وفى قمته للجنب المذكور مآ إلى الغربى
مواضع يحتاج الى اقتقادها بالمرمات سفلا وعلوا. وفى هذا الجنب
جدار مخرب قلع طوبه قبل ... وجنب تهدم قبل ... يحتاج الى
مرمة ذلك سفلا وعلرا. وبرحاب الكنيسة ظاهرها دهليز يتوصل
15 منه الى باب الكنيسة به جدار تهدم عاليه وقلع بابه. والباب
المذكور للآن موجود بالكنيسة يحتاج الى مرمة الجدار واعادة
الباب المذكور .. من المتعرضين وبداخل الكنيسة خرابة بها
جنب به مرمات دائرة ارتفاع ثمانية اذرع فى ستة اذرع يحتاج الى
مرمته بالبناء علوا وسفلا. وفى حدّها الشرقى داخلها كتف
20 معيب وسقف علو ذلك يحتاج الى مرمته واعادة سقفه بجواره مرتب.
بها جنب يحتاج الى اصلاحه ومرمة الكتف الذى بالحد الغربى

والى سدّه بالاشباب قبل سقوطه واعادته. وبها خرابة ثانية من داخلها فى حدّها الغربى بها مرّمات وبصدرها من جهة القبلة مرّمة لطبقة يحتاج الى اصلاحها ومرّماتها وبدور قاعتها علو الاعمدة الرخام كتف معيب ونسب . . . مرّمة يسيرة يجاوره باب 5 به كتف محتاج الى اصلاح ذلك ومرّمته بالبناء. ويدخل من الباب المذكور الى مكان به ثلاثة مراحيض معيبة محتاج الى المرّمة والاصلاح سفلا وعلوا. وبالحجاز المتوصّل منه الى الكنيسة جنبان يمينه ويسرة محتاجان الى مرّمات دائرة علوا وسفلا. وبالحجاز المذكور سلّم يصعد منه الى علو الكنيسة على يمينه الصاعد وعلى يسرة الصاعد باب خلوة به كتف مفسّخ ويقابله جنب معيب 10 محمول على اشباب السدّ محتاج الى مرّمة ذلك. وبعلو الكنيسة المذكورة اشباب مكسّوة وتدلّ مكسّو ومحمول على اشباب السدّ محتاج الى اصلاح ذلك واصلاح اشباب ما بين السقفين. وبعلو كتف مجاور . . . فى الحدّ الشرقى محمول على اشباب السدّ 15 محتاج الى اصلاح ذلك ومرّمته. وبالسلم المذكور مرّمات فى العلو به دائرة متفرقة محتاج الى اصلاحها ومرّماتها سفلا وعلوا. وبعلو الكنيسة سقف معيب محتاج الى مرّمته. وبعلو فى الجهة الشرقية بالجنب المذكور جدار سقط. وبعلو طباق خراب فى الدور الثالث محتاج الى تقريعها وسرب الانقاص التى بها لتخفّ عن السفلى وليرمّ 20 بالانقاص المذكورة ما يحتاج الى مرّمته ممّا يدار فيه. ويحيط بالكنيسة المذكورة حدود اربعة الحدّ القبلى ينتهى الى الخرائب.

والحدّ الجبرّي ينتهى الى الخرائب ايضا. وفي هذا الحدّ المسجد
المقدّم ذكره اعلاه المحتاج الى المرمّة والاصلاح مقدّما مرّمته على
ما ذكر. والحدّ الشرقيّ ينتهى الى الخرائب وفيه باب الكنيسة
المذكورة وباب القاعة التى هى من حقوق الكنيسة المذكورة
5 المعروفة بقاعة الجبن. والحدّ الغربى ينتهى الى الخرائب. ولم يكن
بجوار هذه الكنيسة المذكورة من جوانبها الاربع بناء ولا سكن بل
هى فى وسط الخرائب والكيهان الآن.

وثبت مضمون الكشف المذكور مع قدّم ما كشف اعلاه لدى
سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين شرف
العلماء اوجد الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين الحاكم الآذن المشار اليه
10 باعالية ايد الله احكامه واحسن اليه الثبوت الشرعىّ بالبيّنة
الشرعية. واتصل به احسن الله تعالى اليه اشهاد سيّدنا العبد
الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ الامام العلامة شهاب الدين شرف
العلماء اوجد الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين ابى العباس احمد . .
15 الشافعىّ خليفة الحكم العزيز بالديار المصرية ايد الله تعالى
احكامه واحسن اليه على نفسه الكريمة بما نُسب اليه من الثبوت
والحكم بموجب الاشهاد الشريف الصادر من مولانا السلطان
المالك الملك الاشرف سلطان الاسلام والمسلمين المنوّه باسمه
الشريف اعلاه نصره الله تعالى نصرا عزيزا وفتح له فتحا مبينا
20 وخلّد ملكه وسلطانه ونصر جيوشه واعوانه بالاذن الشريف
المشار اليه باعالية شرفه الله تعالى وعظمه. واتصل به ايضا ما

نُسب لسيّدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام ملك العلماء الاعلام الشهاب العشقلانى الشافعى المشار اليه باعالية تغبّده الله برحمته واسكنه فسيح جنّته فى العهد المشار اليه اعلاه من اقرار اهل الذمّة وما اقرّهم عليه بصريح اللفظ القائم للاقرار المذكور مقام الحكم كما تقدّم باعاليه. 5

وما نُسب لسيّدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام البدرى الزبيرى التنسى المالكى المشار اليه باعالية تغبّده الله تعالى برحمته ورضوانه من الحكم المسطر بهامش نسخة العهد المشار اليه باعاليه بالالتزام المسطر بالفصل المسطر بهامش نسخة العهد المذكور اتصلا صحيحا شرعيا تاما معتبرا 10

مرضيا بالبيّنة الشرعيّة على الوجه الشرعى واذن ايد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه لهم فى ترميم ما يحتاج اليه الكنائس المذكورة اعلاه على الحكم المشروع اعلاه التى من جعلتها الكنيستان المذكورتان اعلاه بما يكفى ذلك من المون الصالحة لذلك.

ومنع ايد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه من الزيادة على ذلك اذنا ومنعا صحيحين شرعيين عالما بالخلاف فى ذلك. واشهد على نفسه الكريمة بذلك وبأنّ كلّا من الاذن والمنع المشرحين اعلاه قائم مقام الحكم مع العلم بالخلاف فى ذلك حسبما شرح ذلك فى محضر الكشف المؤرّخ بالسابع والعشرين من شهر رمضان المعظّم قدره وحرّمته سنة تسع وحمسين وثمانى مائة مشمول 20

بخط سيّدنا الحاكم الآذن المشار اليه باعاليه احسن الله تعالى

اليه بما مثاله الله أحمد على انعامه مكمل برسوم من حضر
الكشف المذكور حجة الحاكم المشار اليه من الموقعين
والمهندسين .

ولما جرى ذلك ومضى عليه مدة طويلة وحصل بذلك الشناعة
5 على اهل الذمة باتهم بنوا كنائسهم واديرتهم بمصر المحروسة
مخالفين في ذلك الشرع الشريف ورفع الامر في ذلك لمولانا
السلطان المالك الملك الاشرف والامام الاعظم المنوّه باسمه
الشريف باعاليه نصره الله تعالى نصرا عزيزا وفتح له فتحا مبينا .
وامر بعقد مجلس شريف بحضرته الشريفة . وعقد مجلس شريف
10 بسبب ذلك بحضرته الشريفة لقضاة القضاة مشائخ الاسلام ذوي
المذاهب الاربعة ادام الله تعالى ايامهم واعزّ احكامهم واحسن
اليهم واسبغ نعمه في الدارين عليهم . وحصل في ذلك تنازع وكلام
كثير بين السادة الحاضرين بالمجلس الشريف بسبب العهد
المذكور اعلاه وبسبب ما نسب لسيّدنا ومولانا قاضي القضاة بدر
15 الدين قاضي المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابي الاخلاص
حمد الزبيرى التنسى المالكى المشار اليه باعاليه تغمّده الله
تعالى برحمته .

وقرر المرسوم الشريف شرّفه الله وعظّمه للسادة الموالى قضاة
القضاة مشائخ الاسلام ادام الله تعالى ايامهم واسبغ عليهم الفضل
20 والانعام بالتوجه الى الكنائس المذكورة ووقع التوافق بين السادة
الموالى قضاة القضاة مشائخ الاسلام ادام الله تعالى ايامهم واعزّ

احكامهم على يوم معدوم يتوجهون فيه لمصر الحروسة لكشف
 الكنائس بها. فتوجه السادة الموالى قضاة القضاة مشائخ الاسلام
 ذوو المذاهب الاربعة امتنع الله بوجودهم الانام ثم سيدنا ومولانا
 العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الامام العالم العلامة الحبر البحر
 5 الفهامة المجتهد للامة الحافظ الرحلة المحقق العمدة المدقق
 الحجة علم الدين لسان المتكلمين حجة المناظرين بقیة
 المجتهدین رحلة الطالبین قدوة العلماء العالمین شیخ الاسلام
 مفتی الانام محقق القضايا والاحكام صدر مصر والشام حسنة
 الديالى والايتام خطيب الخطباء امام الفحاء والبلغاء والادباء قاضى
 10 المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابو الثقا صالح الكنائى البلقبنى
 الشافعى وسيدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ الامام
 العامل العالم العلامة الحبر البحر الفهامة المجتهد للامة الحافظ
 الرحلة المحقق العمدة المدقق الحجة سعد الدين لسان المتكلمين
 حجة المناظرين بقیة المجتهدین رحلة الطالبین قاع المبتدعین
 15 شيخ الاسلام مفتی الانام محقق القضايا والاحكام صدر مصر
 والشام حسنة الديالى والايتام ناصر الحق مؤيد الشريعة قاضى
 المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابى السعادات سعد العيسى
 الديرى الحنفى. وسيدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ
 الامام العالم العامل العلامة الاوحد الحجة الحافظ الرحلة المحقق
 20 العمدة المجتهد للامة ولى الدين لسان المتكلمين حجة المناظرين
 بقیة المجتهدین رحلة الطالبین قاع المبتدعین حى السنة

مؤيد الشريعة قاضي المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابو البركات
احمد الكنانى الحنبلى النظار فى الاحكام الشرعية بالديار المصرية
وسائر الممالك الشريفة الاسلاميّة ادام الله تعالى ايّامهم واعز
احكامهم واحسن اليهم واسبغ نعمه فى الدارين عليهم. وسيّدنا
5 العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ الامام العالم العامل العلامة
الاوحد الحجّة المحقّق العمدة امين الدين لسان المتكلمين حجّة
المناظرين عمدة المحقّقين اوحد المجتهدين عالم المسلمين
ابو زكرياء يحيى الاقصرآى الحنفى اعزّ الله تعالى به الدين ونفع
ببركته وعلومه المسلمين وجماعة من السادة النّوّاب فى الحكم
10 العزيز بالقاهرة ومصر المحروسين ايّد الله تعالى احكامهم
واحسن اليهم.

وكشف الكنائس الكائنة بمصر المحروسة ومن جملتها كنيسة
اليهود بخطّ المصاصة بخرائب مصر المحروسة بحضور سيّدنا العبد
القيّر الى الله تعالى الشيخ امين الدين مفتى المسلمين الاقصرآى
15 الحنفى المشار اليه باعالية احسن الله تعالى اليه وجماعة من
النّوّاب فى الحكم العزيز اجلّ الله تعالى منهم سيّدنا العبد
القيّر الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين الحاكم الحنفى المشار
اليه باعالية ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه وجماعة من
موقعى الحكم العزيز وجم غفير من المسلمين وجماعة من
20 المهندسين هم المعلّم على بن محمد بن سطوح والمعلّم خليل
بن ابراهيم المعروف بابن صمار والمعلّم ابراهيم بن عبد الله

المعروف بعكروت والمعلم احمد بن محمد المعروف بابن الفاخوري
 كشفا شافيا. فوجد بها ما رُمّ بها حسب التمكين من مرمتها
 حسب الاذن الصادر من سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى
 الشيخ افضل الدين شرف العلماء اوحده الفضلاء مفتي المسلمين
 5 ابي الفضل محمود القرمي الحنفى الحاكم المشار اليه ايد الله تعالى
 احكامه واحسن اليه في التمكين من المرمّة وما رُمّ بها زيادَةً على
 ذلك ممّا لم يحصل فيه اذن ظانين انه اذن عامّ وهو اذن خاصّ
 فبنوا بالكنائس الكائنة بمصر المحروسة المنسوبة للنصارى ما
 حصل الاذن فيه وما لم يصدر اذن فيه.

10 وعاد السادة الموالى قضاة القضاة مشائخ الاسلام وسيّدنا الشيخ
 امين الدين الاقصر آوى الحنفى المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله تعالى
 ايامهم واحسن اليهم واسبغ فضله وانعامه عليهم لمولانا السلطان
 المالك الملك الاشرف المنوّه باسمه الشريف اعلاه نصره الله تعالى
 نصرا عزيزا وفتح له فتحا مبينا واخبروه بما وجد في الكنائس
 15 المعروفة بكنائس النصارى المذكورة فيه من القدر الزائد الذى رُمّ
 ببعض كنائس النصارى وبالقدر المأذون فيه بالتمكين من ترميمه
 وبأنّ كنائس اليهود الكائنة بمصر المحروسة لم يكن زيدها
 شيء ممّا أُذن فيه غير أنّ الكنيسة المعروفة بالمصاصة الكائنة
 بجرائب مصر المحروسة المنسوبة لليهود وجد بها بعض مؤونة
 20 من الطين والجير والرماد والاشخاب مطروحة على الارض بداخلها
 بسبب الترميم المأذون فيه.

وبرز مرسوم مولانا السلطان الامام الاعظم المقام الشريف المالك
 الملك الاشرف المنوّه باسمه الشريف اعلاه شرّفه الله تعالى وعظّمه
 ونصّر مولانا السلطان المشار اليه نصرا عزيزا وفتح له فتحا
 مبينا بان يعاد الكشف المذكور ثانيا وان يزال ما تعدوا بفعله
 5 مما لم يؤذن في ترميمه وان يبقى ما حصل الاذن والتكفين في
 ترميمه وان يفعل في ذلك حكم الشرع الشريف.

فتوجّه السادة الموالى قضاة القضاة مشائخ الاسلام المشار اليهم
 اعلاه ادام الله تعالى ايامهم واعزّ احكامهم واحسن اليهم واسبغ
 نعمة في الدارين عليهم وسيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ
 10 الامام العالم العامل العلامة امين الدين عالم المسلمين عمدة
 المحقّقين الاقتصرا على الحنفى المشار اليه باعاليه اعزّ الله تعالى به
 الدين ونفع بعلومه المسلمين وصحبتهم الجنا ب العالى الكبيرى
 العضدى الناصرى السيفى الحاجبى امير صاحب الملكى الشرفى
 والجنا ب العالى الاميرى الكبيرى العضدى الناصرى السيفى تغرى
 15 بردى الدردكى الحاجبى الملكى الاشرفى اعزّهما الله تعالى وجماعة
 من السادة المتولين فى الحكم العزيز بالقاهرة ومصر المحروستين
 ايد الله تعالى احكامهم واحسن اليهم ومنهم سيّدنا العبد الفقير
 الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين سيف العلماء اوحد الفضلاء
 مفتى المسلمين الحاكم الاكبر المشار اليه اعلاه الى مصر
 20 المحروسة لكشف الكنائس المذكورة بها ثانيا.

وكشفت الكشف الشافى بحضور سيّدنا الشيخ امين الدين

الاقصر آىّ المشار اليه احسن الله تعالى اليه والشيخ افضل الدين
المشار اليه وجماعة من نواب الحكم العزيز والحاجبين المشار اليهما
اعلاه وجماعة من موقعى الحكم العزيز والمهندسين وجمّ غفير
من المسلمين. وهُدِم من الكنائس المنسوبة للنصارى ما تعدوا
5 بفعله وهو أنّهم بنوا بالكنيسة المعروفة بكنيسة ابو جرج كتفا
وقنطرة بنيت ... عوضا عن الاجناب المأذون فى ترميها وطلب
القائم بالكنيسة المذكورة وهو ميخائيل بن شريكس ... بها.
وامر سيدنا الشيخ افضل الدين الحاكم الاكبر فى التمكين
المشار اليه باعليه بضرب النصرانى المذكور الضرب المؤلم المبرح
10 بحضرة الاميرين الحاجبين المشار اليهما اعلاه. ف ضرب الضرب
المبرح المؤلم الزاجر له ولا مثاله حاسرا عن اثره. واشهر بالقاهرة
ومصر المحروستين واعتقل بسجن الديلم بالقاهرة المحروسة ايّاما
تعزيرا له على ما حدث منه من البناء الزائد على القدر الذى
صدر فيه الاذن والتمكين من الحاكم المشار اليه وعلى ما صدر
15 منه من تمكين من تعاطى فعل ذلك.

وقصد بعض من حضر الكشف المذكور ان يهدم جميع ما رُم
بالكنائس المذكورة فيه متمسكا بما صدر به الاشهاد المتقدم على
اهل الذمّة وعم يُؤتَس وجماعته المذكورون فى فصل الاشهاد المسطر
بهامش نسخة العهد الشريف المشار اليه الصادر فى ايّام الدولة
20 الظاهرية سقى الله تعالى عهد ملكه وتغبده بالرحمة والرضوان
واسكنه فسيح الجنان المؤرّخ الاشهاد المذكور فيه بنواريخ اولها

التاسع عشر من شهر رمضان المعظم قدره وحرمنه من شهور سنة
ست واربعين وثمانمائة وأحرها السادس من شوال المبارك من
السنة المذكورة اعلاه وهي سنة ست واربعين وثمانمائة. ومضمون
الاشهاد الموعود بذكر المنبّه عليه باعاليه المكتتب بهامش العهد
5 المذكور اشهاد يونس البطريك كان وجماعته المذكورين اعلاه
وغيرهم ممّا لم يسمّ في الاشهاد المذكور فيه أنّه الّزم نفسه الزاما
شرعيّا أنّه لا يحدّد في كنيسة له ولا في دير ولا في قلاية ولا في
صومعة ولا في بيعة الكائن ذلك كلّه في مملكة السلطان الملك
الظاهر المشار اليه فيه سقى الله تعالى عهده بنفسه ولا بمن
10 يستعين به في ذلك بناء ولا غيره ولا يرمّ ما خرب او تعيب من
جدرانها واخشابها وغير ذلك بالالات القديمة ولا غيرها. ولا يرفع
لمسلم خمرًا ببيع ولا بغيره بوجه من الوجوه ولا يسقيه لمسلم.
ومنى خالف ذلك او شيئا منه او خرج عن ذلك او عن شيء
منه كان جزاؤه بان يخرب السلطان الملك الظاهر المشار اليه
15 جميع الكنيسة او الدير او القلاية او الصومعة او البيعة التي يفعل
فيها ذلك وان يرى مولانا السلطان المنبّه باسمه الشريف اعلاه
راية الشريف بحسب ما يختار. وجعل ذلك شرطًا على نفسه والحقه
بالشروط المتقدّمة التي عهد عليه قبل تأريخه المشروحة في نسخة
العهد المذكور في الايام الظاهريّة حسب سؤاله لذلك ورضاه به لما
20 علم لنفسه وللإسلام والمسلمين في ذلك من الحظّ والمصلحة.

[و]بعد ان عرف كلّ منهم معنى ذلك وما يترتّب عليه شرعا

وتمسكاً بالحكم الصادر من سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة بدر الدين قاضى المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين ابى الاخلاص محمد الزبيرى التنسى المالكى المشار اليه تغمده الله تعالى بالرحمة والرضوان على كل من المشهود عليه المذكورين اعلاه بموجب ما اشهد به على نفسه الحكم الشرعى المسول فيه المستوفى فى شرائطه 5 الشرعية من دعوى صدرت عليهم من مدعى شرعى مسبوعة دعواه شرعا واقامة بيّنة بصدور ذلك منه واعذار منه لمجلس الحكم العزيز المشار اليه بصريح اللفظ وغير ذلك مما يجب اعتباره شرعا مع العلم بالخلاف فى ذلك وان ذلك مانع من ترميم الكنائس المذكورة فيه وغيرها مقتضى ان تخرب الكنائس المذكورة. 10 ودار الكلام فى الحكم المذكور هل هو جزئى او كلى. واذا كان الحكم جزئيا فلا يتعدى الى غير ما صدر الحكم عليه واذا التزم الملتزم ايّا كان بحراب كنيسة لم تكن جارية فى ملكه هل يكون هذا الالتزام صحيحا. فيسوغ الحكم به ويعمل بمقتضاه. وتأمل من حضر مجلس الكشف المذكور فصل الاشهاد المذكور والحكم به وما 15 اشير اليه من الاعذار الذى هو شرط فى الحكم عند السادة المالكية.

وسأل هل يتعدى الحكم المذكور لمن لم يعذر اليه فيه ام لا. وتأمل سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام السعدى البدرى الحنفى الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله تعالى ايامه واعز 20 احكامه واعلا معاليه واحسن اليه واسبغ نعمة فى الدارين عليه ما

صدر من نائبه سيّدنا الشيخ افضل الدين مفتى المسلمين الحاكم الاكبر المشار اليه اعلاه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه في محضر الكشف المذكور. فوجده مصابقا لقواعد مذهبه الشريف من ان لاهل الذمّة ترميم ما خرب من كنائسهم واديرتهم وموافقا لما اقترهم عليه سيّدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى قاضى القضاة ملك العلماء شيخ الاسلام الحافظ الشهابى العسقلانى الشافعى الناظر فى الاحكام الشرعيّة بالديار المصريّة وسائر الممالك الشريفة الاسلاميّة كان تعمّده الله تعالى بالرحمة والرضوان فى العهد الذى جدّده على اهل الذمّة فى الايام الظاهريّة حسب الامر الشريف السلطانى الملكى الظاهرى المشار اليه سقى الله تعالى عهده له فى ذلك ولموافقته مذهب الشريف فى تجديد العهد على من يحدّث من اهل الذمّة ولموافقته العهد العبرىّ المأخوذ على اهل الذمّة فى الايام الصلاحيّة والاّيام الناصريّة. فرأى انّ العمل فى ذلك على ما سلف من نحو ثمانمائة سنة الى تأريخه من غير تعقب بنكير هو المعمول به. وانّ حكم سيّدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة البدرىّ التنسىّ المالىّ المشار اليه باعاليه تعمّده الله تعالى برحمته ورضوانه بالالتزام المذكور اعلاه الصادر منه فى الدولة الظاهريّة ليس هو مانعا من الاذن الشريف الصادر من مولانا السلطان المالك الملك الاشرف ابى النصر اينال المشار اليه باعاليه نصره الله تعالى نصرا عزيزا وفتح له فتحا مبينا المشروح ذلك باعاليه ولا من حكم الحاكم الحنفىّ من التمكين

في الترميم بالكنائس القديمة وتبقيّة ما رُمّوه فيها وان هذا هو المعمول به.

وفوض لنا بيد سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ
افضل الدين شرف العلماء اوجد الفضلاء مفتي المسلمين ابي
الفضل محمود القرميّ الحنفيّ الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله 5
تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه النظر في ذلك من معاملة اهل الذمّة
في كنائسهم واديرتهم وصوامعهم واماكنتهم بما يقتضيه حكم
الشرع الشريف على قاعدة مذهب الشريف. وان يحكم في ذلك
على قاعدة مذهب الشريف.

فعند ذلك توجه سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ 10
افضل الدين الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه
واحسن اليه الى حيث الكنائس المذكورة اعلاه وصحبته من يضع
خطه فيه من موقعي الحكم العزيز بالديار المصريّة اجلّ الله
تعالى وادام بركة متوليّه وايّامه والمعلّم سبال محمّد بن احمد
المهندس المعروف بالقراقي والمعلّم شهاب الدين احمد بن محمّد 15
المهندس المعروف بابن الفاخوري المهندسين بالقاهرة الحروسية
الى حيث الكنيسة الكائنة بحارة زويلة المنسوبة لليهود القرائين
بداخل حارة القرائين بالحارة المذكورة بالقاهرة الحروسية. فوجدت
بالصفة القديمة والحادثة بالترميم المأذون فيه من سيّدنا
الحاكم الحنفيّ المفوض له ذلك من مستنبيه المشار اليه 20
باعاليه ادام الله تعالى ايّامه واعلا معاليه كما شرح ذلك

باعاليه بالاذن الحكيمى المشار اليه باعاليه من غير زيادة على ذلك.

وثبت ذلك لدى سيدنا الحاكم الشيخ افضل الدين المشار اليه اعلاه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه الثبوت الشرعى 5 بالبيّنة الشرعية والمشاهدة لذلك والتشخيص له.

فعند ذلك سأل من صار سؤاله شرعا وهو عبد الحق شيخ طائفة اليهود القرائين رافع القصة المنبّه عليها اعلاه سيدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين مفتى المسلمين الحاكم الحنفى المشار اليه اعلاه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه الحكم باحترام ما رُمّ بالكنايس المذكورة بالاذن والتمكين 10 المشروحين اعلاه ومنع المعارضة في ذلك وبالتمكين من ترميم ما بقى مما اذن في ترميمه بالكنايس المذكورة اعلاه والاشهاد على نفسه الكريمة بذلك. فاستخار الله سبحانه وتعالى سيدنا الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه واجاب 15 السائل الى سؤاله وحكم بما سأله الحكم به فيه حكما صحيحا شرعيا تاما معتبرا مرضيا مسولا في ذلك مستوفيا شرائطه الشرعية مع العلم بالخلاف في ذلك واشهد على نفسه الكريمة بذلك.

ثم راجع سيدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين الحاكم الحنفى المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه مستنبيه سيدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى 20 الشيخ الامام العالم العامل العلامة قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام

السعدى العيسى الديرى الحنفى المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله
 تعالى ايامه واعز احكامه فى تنفيذ الحكم المنسوب لسيّدنا العبد
 الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ شهاب الدين شرف العلماء اوحده
 الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين ابى العباس احمد البرحى الشافعى
 5 خليفة الحكم العزيز بالديار المصرية ايد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن
 اليه بموجب الاشهاد بالاذن الشريف السلطاني الملكى الاشرفى
 المشار اليه فيه شرفه الله تعالى وعظمه وفى تنفيذ ما نسب لسيّدنا
 ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى المرحوم قاض القضاة شيخ
 الاسلام ملك العلماء الاعلام الشهابى العسقلانى الشافعى المشار
 10 اليه باعاليه تغمّده الله تعالى بالرحمة والرضوان من الترميم
 القائم مقام الحكم المشروح فى العهد المشار اليه باعاليه الموعود
 بذكره فيه وذكر مقاصده المشروط لهم وعليهم الذى من نصّه
 سؤال اهل الذمّة فيه

سألناكم للامان¹ لانفسنا وذرائنا واموالنا واهل ملّتنا وشرطنا
 15 لكم على انفسنا ان لا فحّثت فى مدينتنا ولا فيما حولها² ديرا
 ولا كنيسة ولا قلّاية ولا صومعة لراهب³ ولا نجّدها اذا خربت ولا
 نجّبي ما دثر⁴ منها فى حطط المسلمين⁵ ولا نمزع كنائسنا ولا

[H = Hamaker; K = Kanz al-'Ummāl; S = Sirāj al-Mulūk; B = Belin (J.A., 1852, p. 128).]

راهب³ HKB³ حولنا² H² الامان¹ HKB¹

ولا نجّدها ما خرب منها HKB⁴

كان مختطّا منها S⁵; كان HKB⁵

المسلمين S⁶ > by mistake to next

اديرتنا⁷ ان ينزلها احد من المسلمين في ليل او⁸ نهار وان
 توسّع ابوابها للمارة^{8a} وابن السبيل وان نُنزلَ بها من مرّ من
 المسلمين نطعمهم ضيافةً ثلاث ليال.¹⁰ ولا نعلّم اولادنا القرآن ولا
 نظهر شركاً¹¹ ولا ندعوا اليه احداً ولا نمنع احداً من ذوى¹² قرابتنا
 5 الدخول في الاسلام¹³ ان اراد. وان نوثّر المسلمين ونقوم لاكبرهم¹⁴
 من مجالسنا اذا ارادوا الجلوس ولا تنتشبه بهم في شيء¹⁵ من مركوبهم
 وملبوسهم حتّى العمامة والنعلين وفرق الشعر. ولا نتكلّم بكلامهم
 ولا نتكنّى بكناهم. ولا نركب السروج ولا نتقلّد السيوف¹⁶ ولا
 نتخذ شيئاً من السلاح ولا نحمله¹⁷ ولا فنقش على¹⁸ خواتمنا بالعربيّة
 10 ولا نظهر بيع الخمر. وان نجزّ مقام²⁰ رؤسنا.²¹ وان نلزم زيتنا

ولا اديرتنا > HK⁷

ونهار B ; ولا HK⁸

للمارين B^{8a}

; وان فنزل من نزلها من المسلمين ثلاث ليالى نطعمهم⁹ H
 ; وان فنزل من مرّ بنا من المسلمين ثلاثة ايام [ليال B] نطعمهم KB
 وان فنزل من مرّ بنا S as text, but

ولا ناوى [نؤمن K] في كنائسنا ولا [في BS +] منارلنا + HKBS¹⁰
 جاسوسا ولا [B >] نكتّم غشا للمسلمين

شرعنا B ; شرعا S¹¹

> K¹²

لهم HKSB¹⁴ ان اراده S ; اذا اراده K ; ان اراده HB¹³

من لباسهم [ملابسهم B] من [في B] قلنسوة ولا عمامة HKS¹⁵

بالسيوف S¹⁶

معنا HKSB¹⁷

> K¹⁸

ولا نبيع الخمر HKSB¹⁹

مقاديم K²⁰

ونلزم SB²¹

حيث ما كنّا.^{21a} وان نشد زنايرنا²² على اوساطنا.²³ ولا نظهر صلباننا وكتبنا في شيء من مجامع²⁴ المسلمين واسواقهم²⁵ وطرقهم.²⁶ ولا نرفع اصواتنا بالقراءة في كنائسنا²⁷ ولا في غيرها بحضرة المسلمين.²⁸ ولا نخرج في الشعانين والاعباد جميعا. ولا نرفع اصواتنا مع موتانا.⁵ ولا نظهر النيران²⁹ معهم في طرق المسلمين³⁰ ولا في اسواقهم.³¹ ولا نجاورهم³² موتانا. ولا نتخذ من الرقيق من³³ جرت عليه سهام المسلمين.³⁴ ولا نطلع عليهم في منازلنا³⁵ ولا نضرب

كان B^{21a}

الزناير KSB²²

وان لا, B; وان لا نظهر الصليب على كنائسنا + HKS²³ وان لا نضرب بناقوس في كنائسنا بين حضرة المسلمين وان لا نخرج

طرق HSB²⁴

ولا اسواقهم HSB²⁵

ولا نضرب بنواقيسنا في كنائسنا الا ضربا خفيفا + HSB > HSB²⁶ for K see note 23.

بحضرة المسلمين B; في شيء من حضرة المسلمين HS²⁷

ولا نخرج شعانينا ولا باعوثا H [ولا نخرج جميعا²⁸ ولا نرفع شعانينا ولا طاغوتنا B; ولا نخرج في شعانينا ولا باعوثنا S

معهم في شيء من HK; في شيء من طرق المسلمين BS²⁹ طرق المسلمين

ولا اسواقهم HB > K³⁰

بموتانا SB³² ولا نجاورهم موتانا H >³¹

ما جرت B; ما جرى HKS³³

ولا نطلع عليهم في بنيان لهم K; ولا نتطلع على منازلهم KSB³⁴

فلما اتيت عمر بن الخطاب رض بالكتاب زاد فيه + KSB³⁵

احدا من المسلمين³⁶ ولا نشتمه ولا نشترى من سبايا المسلمين شيئا وقد شرطنا لكم^{36a} ذلك على انفسنا واهل ملتنا وقبلنا عليه³⁷ الامان³⁸ على ان تعطونا ذمة الله وذمة المسلمين ان لا يكلف احدٌ منا ما لا طاقة له به ولا غير ما شرط. وان لا يظلم 5 احدٌ منا في نفس ولا اهل ولا ولد ولا اتباع ولا مال ولا معبد من معابدنا وان من ظلم احدا منا كان على المسلمين ردة وردّ المظلمة على صاحبها. ومن خالف ذلك منا فلا ذمة له ولا عهد وحلّ لكم منه ما حلّ لاهل المعاندة والشقاق.

وسأل اكبرهم اى اهل الذمة المذكورة اسماؤهم باعاليه وهم يؤتس وجماعتهم المذكورون اعلاه وقيلوتواس بطريك النصارى الملكيين 10 وعبد اللطيف بن ابراهيم بن شمس رئيس طائفة اليهود الربانيين وفرج الله بن موسى احد مشائخ طائفة اليهود القرائين وابراهيم بن سلامة بن ابراهيم كبير طائفة السمرة سيدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام الحافظ الشهابي 15 العسقلاني الشافعي المشار اليه باعاليه تغبده الله تعالى برحمته

³⁶ HKSB > ولا نشتمه وقد ^{36a} B >

³⁷ K عنهم B ولنا عليه الامان

³⁸ HKS end as follows after الامان : فى نحن خالفنا فى شىء : [فى شىء K ; شياً B] منا شرطناه لكم وضمتنا [وضمتناه B] على انفسنا فلا ذمة لنا وقد حلّ لكم ما يحلّ [حلّ B ; لكم + K] من اهل المعاندة والشقاق

ورضوانه ان يقرّهم بالشروط المذكورة اعلاه ورضوا بها والتزموا احكامها.

فاجاب سيّدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام الشهابيّ العسقلانيّ الشافعيّ المشار اليه فيه تغمّده الله برحمته سؤالهم 5 وقال لهم بصريح لفظه اقررّكم ببلاد الاسلام الاّ الحجاز استيطاناً وحرّم مكّة مروراً على هذه الشرائط اذا بذلتكم الجزية على العادة المستمرة ومن جملة ما شرح في نسخة العهد المذكور خاتمةً في الشروط المذكورة اعلاه ما يحتاج الى حلّ مشكل وتبيين مجمل. ومن ذلك المراد بالاحداث في المدينة التي اقرّوا في سكنها اعم 10 من ان تكون صغيرة او كبيرة والمراد بها اذا خرب منها ان تخرب الكنيسة فلا تعاد بخلاف ما اذا تعيّب جدار منها فلا يمنع من ترميمه بما هو دونه.

فاذن له سيّدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام السعديّ الديريّ الحنفىّ المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله تعالى ايّامه واعزّ 15 احكامه واحسن اليه واسبع نعمه في الدارين عليه فيما سأله في تنفيذه.

فعند ذلك استخار الله تعالى سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين مفتى المسلمين الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه واشهد على نفسه 20 الكريمة من حضر مجلس حكمه وقضائه وهو ناخذ القضاء والحكم ماضيها. وذلك في اليوم المبارك التاسع من صفر ختم بالخير

والظفر سنة ستين وثمانمائة أنه نفذ حكم سيّدنا العبد الفقير
الى الله تعالى الشيخ الامام العلامة شهاب الدين شرف العلماء
اوحّد الفضلاء مفتى المسلمين ابي العباس احمد البرحى الشافعى
الحاكم المشار اليه باعاليه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه
5 المنسوب اليه في ايجاله المنبّه عليه باعاليه المقدم تاريخه باعاليه .
ونفذ ايضا ما نسب لسيّدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام
الحافظ شهاب الدين قاضى المسلمين خالصة امير المؤمنين
العسقلانى الشافعى المشار اليه باعاليه تغمّده الله تعالى بالرحمة
والرضوان من التقرير القائم مقام الحكم المنبّه عليه باعاليه
10 المشروح بنسخة العهد الشريف المشار اليه اعلاه تنفيذًا صحيحًا
شرعيًا تامًا معتبرًا مرضيًا مسولًا في ذلك مستوفيا شرائطه الشرعيّة .
اجاز ذلك وامضاه والزم بمقتضاه واشهد على نفسه الكريمة بذلك
في التاريخ المقدم ذكره باعاليه المكتتب بخطه الكريم اعلاه شرفه
الله تعالى والحمد لله اولا وآخرا .

15 فيه ملحق سأل وفيه سؤال اهل الذمّة فيه وفيه مصلح مانعا
التحرّى بمنع اقدار ذووا على المشار اليه هل مانعا . وفي الملحق
بناء صحيح . ذلك كلّ معنّد به في موضعه . حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل .
اشهدنى سيّدنا ومولانا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ
الامام العالم العامل العلامة الحبر البحر الفهامة المحقق المدقق
20 الرحلة الحافظ المجتهد العبد الخاشع الناسك الحجّة سعد الدين
لسان المتكلّمين حجّة المناظرين رحلة الطالبين امام الاصوليين

قَامَعَ الْمُبْتَدِعِينَ وَالْمُفْسِدِينَ حَيَّى سَنَةَ سَيِّدِ الْمُرْسَلِينَ بَقِيَّةَ
 الْمُجْتَهِدِينَ عَمْدَةَ الْحَدَّثِينَ شَيْخَ الْإِسْلَامِ مُفْتَى الْأَنْامِ مُحَقِّقَ
 الْقَضَايَا وَالْأَحْكَامِ حَسَنَةَ اللَّيَالِي وَالْأَيَّامِ نَاصِرَ الْحَقِّ مُؤَيِّدَ الشَّرِيعَةِ
 بِالْبَرَاهِينِ قَاضِيَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ خَالِصَةَ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَبُو السَّعَادَاتِ
 5 سَعْدِ الْعَبْسِيِّ الدِّيَرِيِّ الْحَنْفِيِّ الْمَشَارِئِيهِ بِأَعَالِيهِه أَدَامَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى
 أَيَّامَهُ وَاعَزَّ أَحْكَامَهُ وَاحْسَنَ إِلَيْهِه وَاسْبَغَ نِعْمَهُ فِي الدَّارَيْنِ عَلَيْهِ عَلَى
 نَفْسِهِ الْكَرِيمَةِ حَرَّسَهَا اللَّهُ تَعَالَى وَحَمَاهَا وَصَانَهَا بِمَا نَسَبَ إِلَيْهِه
 أَعْلَاهُ . . . عَلَيْهِ بِهِ وَعَلَى نَائِبِهِ فِي الْحُكْمِ الْعَزِيزِ سَيِّدِنَا الْعَبْدِ
 الْفَقِيرِ إِلَى اللَّهِ تَعَالَى الشَّيْخِ أَفْضَلِ الدِّينِ سَيِّدِ الْعُلَمَاءِ وَاحِدِ
 10 الْفَضْلَاءِ مُفْتَى الْمُسْلِمِينَ أَبِي الْفَضْلِ مُحَمَّدِ الْقُرْمِيِّ الْحَنْفِيِّ
 الْحَاكِمِ الْمَشَارِئِيهِ بِأَعَالِيهِه أَيْدِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى أَحْكَامَهُ وَاحْسَنَ إِلَيْهِه
 بِمَا نَسَبَ إِلَيْهِه وَحَضَرَتْ كَشَفَ الْكُنَائِسِ الْمَذْكُورَةِ أَعْلَاهُ صَحْبَةً مِنْ
 عَيْنِ أَعْلَاهُ فِي الْأَوْقَاتِ الْمُتَفَرِّقَةِ كَمَا شَرَحَ بِأَعَالِيهِه .

وَكُتِبَ

مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ الْجَعْفَرِيِّ

15

الشَّافِعِيِّ .

أَشْهَدُنِي سَيِّدِنَا وَمَوْلَانَا قَاضِيَ الْقَضَاةِ مُلْكُ الْعُلَمَاءِ شَيْخَ الْإِسْلَامِ
 السَّعْدِيِّ الْعَبْسِيِّ الدِّيَرِيِّ الْحَنْفِيِّ قَاضِيَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ خَالِصَةَ أَمِيرِ
 الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الْحَاكِمِ الْمَشَارِئِيهِ أَعْلَاهُ أَدَامَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى أَيَّامَهُ وَاعَزَّ
 20 أَحْكَامَهُ وَاحْسَنَ إِلَيْهِه وَوَالَى نِعْمَهُ عَلَيْهِ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ الْكَرِيمَةِ حَرَّسَهَا
 اللَّهُ تَعَالَى وَضَاعَفَ عَلَيْهَا نِعْمَهُ وَوَالَى بِمَا نَسَبَ إِلَيْهِه أَعْلَاهُ

فشهدت عليه به وعلى نائبه سيّدنا الشيخ افضل الدين المشار
اليه اعلاه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه بما نسب اليه
اعلاه. وحضرت كشف كنائس النصارى اليعاقة الكائنة بمصر
الحروسية وهو الكشف الاخير خلا المعلقة وكنيسة ابي سرجة
5 وكنيسة بربارة كما شرح اعلاه. وكتب

محمد بن محمد النبيه

اخبرنى بذلك بلفظ الشهادة

وبذلك اشهدنى سيّدنا ومولانا قاضى القضاة شيخ الاسلام ملك
العلماء الاعلام حسنة الليالى والايام بقيّة السلف الكرام
10 السعدى الديرى الحنفى المشار اليه باعاليه ادام الله تعالى ايامه
واعزّ احكامه واحسن اليه ووالى نعمه فى الدارين عليه فشهدت
عليه بما نسب اليه باعاليه وعلى نائبه فى الحكم العزيز سيّدنا
الشيخ افضل الدين مفتى المسلمين القرمى المشار اليه باعاليه
ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه بما نسب اليه باعاليه.
15 وحضرت كشف الكنائس المذكورة باعاليه محبة من ذكر باعاليه
فى اوقات متفرقة. وكتب

اشهدنى سيّدنا العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى الشيخ افضل الدين
الحاكم المشار اليه اعلاه ايّد الله تعالى احكامه واحسن اليه
على نفسه الكريمة بما نسب اليه اعلاه. فشهدت عليه بذلك.

وكتب

احمد

الحمد لله اشهد على سمّال محمد بن سمّال محمد بن خلف
المهندس المشهور بالقرافيّ شهوده اشهادا شرعيّا انه كشف
الكنائس المذكورة اعلاه الكشف الشافي الكشف الآخر المذكور
اعلاه .. على ما شرح في .. اعلاه المأذون فيه .

5 شهد بالكشف المذكور على ما شرح باعلى خليل بن على
المهندس عرف بابن بشار .

شهد بالكشف المذكور على ما شرح باعلى على بن احمد
عرف بابن سطوح المهندس .

حضرت الكشف المذكور في خدمة السادة الموالى قضاة القضاة
10 مشائخ الاسلام المشار اليهم اعلاه ادام الله تعالى ايامهم واعزّ
احكامهم والامر كما شرح اعلاه وفي محبة سيّدنا افضل الدين
المشار اليه اعلاه ايّد الله احكامه في الكشف الثاني والاخير كما
شرح فيه .

وكتب احمد بن محمد

ابن احمد المهندس

عرف بالفاخوريّ

THE STROPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK
OF MICAH

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH

THE STROPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF MICAH

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH

The poetic form of Micah has received little attention as compared with that given to Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others of the Prophets. In modern times Ewald (1840) was among the first to attempt a strophical analysis of Micah. Nothing further of any consequence was done till 1891, when H. J. Elhorst, seeking to defend the unity of the book, presented a strophic reorganization of it, characterized by startling novelty, which has thus far met with no general approval. Chaps. 3, 4:6-14, and 7, were treated by D. H. Müller in his *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (1896), the value of which is minimized by an uncritical attitude toward the Massoretic text and by his complicated theory of strophe, antistrophe, responsion, concatenation, etc. Sievers included chap. 1 in his *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik* (1901), in which a too cautious attitude toward the Massoretic text prevails. François Ladame applied the theories of D. H. Müller and Zenner to chaps. 4 and 5 in the *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* for 1902. Marti has given the best treatment of the subject thus far in his *Dodekapropheten* (1904), where the poetic and strophic form is made the basis of the arrangement of the commentary. Chap. 3:1-4, 9-12, is presented as a literary and poetic unit by Löhr, in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. LXI (1907), pp. 3-6.

In the following study the text as reconstructed is presented as the best justification of the analysis. Subsidiary matter has been purposely reduced to the minimum. The text is unpointed except in places where some variation from the Massoretic reading was necessary. Emendations already familiar to all scholars through their incorporation in standard works need no explanation in a study of this kind; therefore only such as are here presented for the first time are treated in the accompanying notes.

Questions pertaining to the date and authenticity of the material in the book of Micah lie outside of the scope of this article, except in so far as concerns minor glosses which interfere with the metric or strophic norm of a passage. For full discussion of such matters reference may be made to the author's forthcoming commentary on Micah in the "International Critical Series."

§ 1. THE SUPERScription, 1:1

דבר יהוה אשר היה אל מיכה המרשתי בימי יוחם אחז יהזקיה
מלכי יהודה אשר חזה על שמרון וירושלם:

§ 2. THE DOOM OF ISRAEL, 1:2-9

שמעו עמים כלם 1:2 I
הקשיבי ארץ ומלאה
ויהי יהוה בכם לעד
אדני מהיכל קדשו:

כִּי־הנה יהוה יצא ממקמו 3 II
וירד על־במותי ארץ:
ונמסו ההרים תחתיו 4a, b
והעמקים יתבקעו

בפשע יעקב כל־זאת 5 III
ובחֲטֹאת בית יהודה
מי־פשע יעקב הלוא שמרון
ומי־חֲטֹאת יהודה הלוא ירושלם:

ושמתי שמרון לְשָׂדֶה 6 IV
למטעי כרם
והגרתי לַפֵּיא אבניה
ויסדיה אגלה:

על־זאת אספדה ואילילה 8 V
אלכה שולל וערום
אעשה מספר כתנים
ואבל כבנות יענה:

9 VI
 כִּי אָנוּשָׁה מִפֶּתַח
 כִּי בָאָה עַד־יְהוּדָה
 נִקְעָה עַד־שַׁעֲרֵי עַמִּי
 עַד יְרוּשָׁלַם:

This arrangement involves the retention of vss. 2-5a as genuine, notwithstanding Stade, Nowack, Marti, *et al.*, and the excision of vss. 4c, d and 7 as later accretions. Nowack has attempted to improve vs. 4 by interchanging the positions of 4b and 4c; but 4a and 4b belong together, similar cases of later expansion by the addition of a comparison are not wanting (cf. 7:10), and the lines 4c and 4d burden the strophe. Marti has already stated the case against vs. 7; in addition may be urged its variation from the strophic norm of the context, in that it consists of five lines:

7
 וְכָל פְּסִילֶיהָ יִכְחוּ
 וְכָל־אֲתֹנֶיָהּ יִשְׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ
 וְכָל עֲצָבֶיהָ אֲשִׁים שְׂמִימָה
 כִּי מֵאֲתָנָן זֹנָה קָבְצוּ
 וְעַד־אֲתָנָן זֹנָה יִשׁוּבוּ:

In vs. 2c omit אֲדָנִי as dittograph from the following line, or as Qerf for יְהוָה; in vs. 3 omit וְדָרַךְ with 𐤀; and in vs. 5b substitute יְהוּדָה for יִשְׂרָאֵל.

§ 3. LAMENTATION OVER ISRAEL'S DOOM, 1:10-16

10 I
 בָּגַת אֵל תִּגִּידוּ
 בְּבִקְאָה בְּכֹו תִבְכוּ
 בְּבִית־אֵל עֶפֶר הִתְפַּלְשׁוּ:
 עֲבְרוּ לָכֶם מִשְׁפִּיר עֲרִיָה 11a
 לֹא יִצְאָהּ יוֹשֶׁבֶת צֹאנָן מִסְפָּרָהּ 11b, c II
 בֵּית הָאֵצֶל יִקַּח מִמֶּעֶמְדוֹ:
 מִי יִחַלֶּה לְטוֹב יוֹשֶׁבֶת מְרוֹת 12
 כִּי־יִרְדֹּעַ רַע מֵאֵת יְהוָה לְשַׁעֲרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם:

רָחֵם הַמְרַמְבָּה לָרֶכֶשׁ יוֹשֶׁבֶת לְכִישׁ 13a, c III

כִּי בֶךְ נִמְצָאוּ פְשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל;

14 לָכֵן תַּחֲנִי שְׁלוּחִים עַל מוֹרֶשֶׁת גֵּת

בֵּית אֲכֹזִיב לְאֲכֹזֵב לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל;

15 עַד הִירֶשׁ אֲבִילָךְ יוֹשֶׁבֶת מִרְשָׁה IV

עַד עוֹלָם יֶאֱכֹד כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל;

16 קִרְחִי וְגֹזִי עַל בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגִיךְ

הִרְחַבִּי קִרְחֶיךָ כְּנֶשֶׁר כִּי־גָלוּ מִמֶּךָ;

The uncertain state of the text of 1:10–16 renders any attempt at reconstruction extremely hazardous. In the foregoing arrangement there is to be seen a gradual transition from the simple trimeter of vs. 10, through the tetrameter of vs. 11, to the pentameter, or *Qinah* movement of vs. 12, which prevails throughout the rest of the piece. The most marked variation from the Massoretic text is in the omission of vs. 13b; this is shown to be a gloss by the fact that it interrupts the connection of 13a and 13c, where direct address is employed.

In vs. 10b, for בִּבְכָא see Halévy, *Revue sémitique*, XII; אֵל is omitted as a dittograph from vs. 10a. For vs. 10c see Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 103. In vs. 11a יוֹשֶׁבֶת is omitted as a dittograph from 11b, and בִּי is restored before שְׁפִיר; בִּשְׁת is omitted, with Ⓢ, as a gloss on עִירָה. In vs. 11b מִסְפֶּד is conjecturally restored to מִסְפֶּרָה; cf. Assyrian *supûru*, 'inclosure' (of a walled city, e. g., Erech). In vs. 11c the verb is pointed as passive, with Graetz; and מִכֶּם עֲמִדְתּוֹ is resolved into מִיַּעֲמִדּוֹ, כִּי and מִי being often confused in the old script; the third מִי is dropped as a dittograph. A similar confusion of כִּי and מִי has taken place in כִּי of vs. 12a, cf. Ⓢ τῆς; and for the force of מִי here, see Am. 7:2, 5. רָחֵם of vs. 13 is the infin. abs. with the force of an imperative; this furnishes the basis for the second person forms of 13b and 14a. For vs. 15b, see Cheyne, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, X, 577.

§4. THE OPPRESSION OF THE POOR, 2:1-11

2:1 I הוֹי חֲשָׁבִי אֹן עַל מִשְׁכַּבְוֹתָם
בְּאֹר הַבֶּקֶר יַעֲשֹׂה כִּי יִשְׁלַל יָדָם:

2 וַחֲמָדוֹ שָׁדוּת וּגְזֹלוֹ וּבְתִים וּנְשָׂאוֹ
וַעֲשָׂקוֹ גִּבֹר וּבֵיתוֹ אִישׁ וּנְחֻלָּתוֹ:

II 3 [לֶכֶן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה]

הֲנִי חֲשַׁב רָעָה
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־חֲמִישׁוֹ מִצְּוֹאֹתֵיכֶם
וְלֹא תִלְכוּ רוּמָה
כִּי עַתָּה רָעָה הִיא:

III 4 בְּיוֹם הַהוּא יֵשֵׁא עֲלֵיכֶם מִשַׁל
וְנָהָה נָהִי לְאֹמֶר
חֶלֶק עָמִי יִמָּד בְּחֶבֶל וְאֵין מִשִּׁיב
לְשׁוֹבֵינוּ שְׂדֵינוּ יִחַלֵּק שְׂדֹדֵנוּ נִשְׁדָּנוּ:

IV 6 אֵל תִּשְׁיָק נְטוּף לֵאלֹהִים
לֹא יִשְׁיֵג בֵּית יַעֲקֹב כְּלָמוֹת:
7 הַקָּצֵר רוּחַ יְהוָה אִסְרָאֵלָה מֵעַלְלֵיו
הַלּוֹא דְבָרָיו יִיטִיבוּ עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל:

V 8 וְאַתֶּם לְעַמִּי לְאוֹיֵב תִּקְוֹמוּ עַל־שֹׁלְמִים
תַּפְשִׁטוּן מֵעֲבָרִים בַּטָּח שְׁבִי מִלַּחְמָה:
9 נָשִׁי עָמִי תִגְרֶשׁוֹן מִבְּנֵי תַעֲנִיָּהָן
מֵעַל עַלְלֵיהֶן תִּקַּח הַדָּרִי לְעוֹלָם:

VI 10 קוּמוּ וּלְכוּ כִּי לֹא־זֹאת הַמְנוּחָה
בַּעֲבוּר טָמְאָה תִּחַבְּלוּ חֶבֶל נִמְרָץ:

The prevailing movement here is that of the *Qinah*, except in Strophe II where the announcement of the coming calamity is in short and sharp phrases. The closing strophe containing the final message of dismissal is likewise concise; possibly it should be arranged in four short lines like Strophe II, but vs. 10b seems to show the *Qinah* movement. Verse 11 is plain prose, and is therefore omitted as a misplaced gloss on vs. 6; its relation to

vs. 6 was already recognized by Dathe (1773) and also by Halévy, who transposes it to follow vs. 11. The words introducing the new speaker in Strophe II are no part of the strophe.

In vs. 1, omit **וַעֲלֵי רַע** as a gloss, with Wellhausen, Nowack, Oort, and Marti. In vs. 3, **עַל הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה הַזֹּאת** is a gloss (cf. Am. 3:1; Jer. 8:3); so Marti. In vs. 3c the first two letters of **בְּשֵׁם** are dropped as a dittograph from **חַמִּישֵׁן**, while the final letter is connected as a preposition with the following word; this emendation removes the difficulty of making **שֵׁם** refer back to the abstract **רַעָה**. The reconstruction of vs. 4 is that proposed by Stade (*ZAW*, VI, 122 f.); so also Ruben, Nowack; cf. Marti. The prosaic character of vs. 5 marks it as an interpolation; so Nowack and Marti. Corruption and dittography account for the state of MT in vs. 6a. The first word of vs. 7 is to be read **הָאֲמִיר** with **⚡**; it is a gloss on **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב**, which latter originally belonged after **יִשִּׁיג** as its emphatic object. The proximity of **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב** perhaps affected the gender of **יִשִּׁיג**, though agreement of a verb with its subject is, of course, not obligatory when the verb stands first. If the position of **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב** in MT be correct, the meaning is, "the speaker is the house of Jacob," and the entire phrase is a gloss. In vs. 8a, **אָדָר** is a gloss on the corrupt **שְׁלֹמָה**.

§ 5. THE RETURN OF THE EXILES, 2:12, 13

12 אָסָה אֲאָסָה יַעֲקֹב כָּלֹךְ
 קִבֵּץ אֶקְבֹּץ שְׁאֵרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 יַחַד אֲשִׁימֵנו כִּצְאוֹן בְּצִיּוֹרָה
 כְּעֹדֵר בַּחוּץ הַדֶּבֶר:
 13 עֲלֵה הַפֶּרֶץ לַפְּנִיחִים
 פֶּרְצוּ שַׁעַר וַיֵּצְאוּ בּוֹ
 וַיַּעֲבֵר מִלְּכֶם לַפְּנִיחִים
 וַיַּהֲרֹה בְּרֹאשָׁם:

The more important variations from MT in this eight-line strophe are, first, the dropping of the last two words of vs. 12 as a corrupt gloss, and, second, the omission of **וַיַּעֲבֵר** from vs. 13b as a dittograph from the following line.

§ 6. DENUNCIATION OF THE LEADERS AND PROPHETS,
3:1-8

[ואמר] 3:1 I

שמעו־נא ראשי יעקב
וקציני בית ישראל
הלוא לכם לדעת את־המשפט:
שנאי טוב ואהבי רָע 2a

אשר אכלו שאר עמי 3 II
ועורם מעליהם הפשיטו
ואת־עצמיהם פצחו ופרשו
פְּשָׁאָר בסיר וכבשר בחוֹך־קלחת:

אז יזעקו אל־יהוה 4 III
ולא יענה אותם
ויסתר פניו מהם
כאשר הרעו מעליהם:

[כה אמר יהוה] 5 IV
על־הנביאים המתעים את־עמי
הנשכים בשניהם וקראו שלום
ואשר לא־יתן על־פיהם
וקדשו עליו מלהמה:

לכן לילה לכם מחזון 6 V
וְחִשְׁקָה לכם מִקָּסָם
ובאה השמש על־הנביאים
וקדר עליהם היום:

ובשו החזים 7 VI
והפרו הקסמים
ועטו על־שפם כלם
כי אין מענה אלהים

ואולם אנכי מלאתי כח 8 VII
ומשפט וגבורה
להגיד ליעקב פשעו
ול־ישראל השאתו:

This piece consists of three strophes dealing with the judges and princes, three devoted to the false prophets, and a closing strophe setting forth the speaker's own qualifications for the prophetic and judicial office. The climax of the doom upon both judges and prophets is the refusal of Yahweh to hear their cry (Strophes III and VI). In this arrangement vs. 2*b, c* is omitted as a variant of vs. 3; so Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti; Löhr omits all except גזלי, but supposes these lines were inserted to supply the place of the missing original. In vs. 4 בעת ההיא is superfluous in meter and in sense, being a mere repetition of אז at the beginning of the verse. The ואמר of vs. 1 and the introductory formula in vs. 5 are extraneous to their respective strophes. In vs. 8 omit את רוח יהוה, with Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, *et al.* Löhr's arrangement of this section and the following, with the omission of vss. 5–8, in eight strophes of three lines each, a tetrameter followed by two trimeters, fails to recognize the symmetrical relations between vss. 1–4 and 5–8 and involves too drastic and arbitrary treatment of the Massoretic text. An inflexible meter of 4 + 3 + 3 for each strophe makes too great inroads upon textual integrity. The fact that Löhr's article did not reach me until after my manuscript was sent to the printer prevents more extended discussion here.

§ 7. THE DOOM OF JERUSALEM, 3: 9–12

9 I שִׁמְעוּנָא זֶאֶת רֹאשֵׁי בֵּית יַעֲקֹב

וְקִצִּי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

הַמִּתְעַבִּים מִשְׁפָּט

וְאֵת כְּלִי־הַיִּשְׁרָה יַעֲקֹשׁוּ;

10 בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן בְּדַמִּים

וִירוּשָׁלַם בַּעוֹלָה;

11 II רֹאשִׁיהָ בִּשְׁחָד יִשְׁפֹּטוּ

וְכַהֲנֶיהָ בַּמַּחֲזִיר יִזְרֹוּ

וְנִבְיָאֶיהָ בַּכֶּסֶף יִקְסְמוּ

וְעַל־יְהוָה יִשְׁעֻנוּ לֵאמֹר

חֲלוּא יְהוָה בִּקְרַבֵּנוּ

לֹא־תִבּוֹא עֲלֵינוּ רָעָה;

לכן בגללכם ¹² III
ציון שדה תחרש
ויירושלם ערים תהיה
והר הבית לבמת יער:

This is the first section in the genuine Micah material to depart from the norm of the four-line strophe. Marti finds that norm here also. But to organize strophes of four lines here is to separate things that belong together; the בני of vs. 10 clearly designates the persons already mentioned in vs. 9, and is inseparable from vs. 9. The three groups mentioned in vs. 11 belong together as the constituent elements of the class addressed in Strophe I; chiefs, priests, and prophets form the great triumvirate, from which the prophets may not be separated and considered by themselves.

The text of this portion is well preserved, requiring few emendations and no transpositions or excisions.

§ 8. AN IDEAL OF YAHWEH'S WORLD-DOMINION, 4:1-5

והיה באחרית הימים ^{4:1} I
יהיה הר בית־יהוה
נכון בראש ההרים
ונשא הוא מגבעות
ונהררו עליו עמים;
² והלכו גוים רבים ואמרו
לכו ונעלה אל־הר־יהוה II
ואל־בית אלהי יעקב
ויורנו מדרכיו
ונלכּה בארחתיו
כי מציון תצא תורה
ודבר יהוה מירושלם:
³ III
ושפט בן־עמים רבים
והוכיח לגוים עצמים
וכתתו חרבתיהם לאתים

והניחיהם למזמרות
לא־ישאו גוי אל־גוי חרב
ולא־ילמדון עוד מלחמה:

4] וישבו איש תחת גפנו
ותחת תאנתו ואין מחריד
כי־פי יהוה צבאות דבר:
5 כי כל־העמים ילכו
איש בשם אלהיו
ואנחנו נלך בשם־יהוה
אלהינו לעולם ועד:]

The original material here stops with vs. 3. Practically all interpreters now concede the separation of vs. 5. Marti also eliminates vs. 4c. But in view of the absence of vs. 4 from the parallel passage in Isaiah, and of the further fact that it is composed of stock phrases which add nothing to the description in vss. 1-3, it seems justifiable to assign the whole of vs. 4 to editorial expansion;¹ עֲד־רָחֹק of vs. 3b is due to the same cause. The three six-line strophes of vss. 1-3 are logically distinct, and the progress of thought is clear: Strophe I states the fact that the temple of Yahweh is to become the rallying-point of the nations; Strophe II indicates the motive of the nations in coming; Strophe III describes the idyllic peace resulting from the world-wide acceptance of Yahweh and his law.

§ 9. THE DOOM OF EXILE AND A PROMISE OF RESTORATION, 4: 6-10

9 I עתה למה חריעי רע
המלך אין בד
אם יועצך אבד
כי־החזיקך חיל ביוֹלדה:

¹This conclusion was reached in entire independence of the discussion by François Ladame, *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, 1902, pp. 446 ff., in which the same decision is expressed.

חולי וגחי בת־ציון כולדה 10 II
 כִּי־עָתָה תִּצְאִי מִקְרִיָּה וּשְׁכֻנָּת בְּשׁוּדָה
 וּבָאֵת עַד בָּבֶל שֵׁם תִּנְצֹלִי
 שֵׁם יִגְאֹלְךָ יְהוָה מִכַּף אִיבֶיךָ:

בְּיוֹם הַהוּא נֹאס־יְהוָה 6 III
 אֶסְפֶּה הַצִּלְעָה
 וְהִנְדַּחְתָּ אֶקְבָּצָהּ
 וְאֲשֶׁר הִרְעֵתִי:

וְשִׁמְתִּי אֶת־הַצִּלְעָה לְשֹׁאֲרֵיהֶּ 7 IV
 וְהִנְחֵלָה לְגוֹי עֲצוּם
 וּמֶלֶךְ יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם בְּהֵר צִיּוֹן
 מִיַּעַתָּה וְעַד עוֹלָם

וְאַתָּה מִגְדֹּל עִדְרָ 8 V
 עֶפְלָ בֵּת צִיּוֹן
 עֲדִיךְ תֵּאֵתָה הַמִּמְשֻׁלָּה הָרִאשֹׁנָה
 וּבָאָה מִמְּלַכַת בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל:

The prevailing measure of this section is trimeter, with sporadic dimeters and Strophe II falling into the dirge movement. In vs. 7c **בְּהֵר צִיּוֹן** is metrically superfluous, and perhaps ought to be dropped as a marginal note; so Marti. Vss. 9–10 are placed before vss. 6–8 in response to the demands of the logical and chronological sense. The resulting movement of thought is clear and straightforward throughout the piece. There is no necessity to posit two authors or differing periods for the two sections, vss. 6–8 and 9, 10; but it may well be that they did not originally constitute one piece, for each section has a measure of completeness within itself. Textually the piece is well preserved; in vs. 8, however, it seems necessary to transpose **וּבָאָה** with Nowack, both on account of meter and sense.

§ 10. THE TRIUMPH OF YAHWEH'S PEOPLE OVER ALL
ITS FOES, 4: 11-14

וַעֲתָה נֹאסְפוּ עֲלֶיךָ ¹¹ I
גוֹיִם רַבִּים הָאֹמְרִים
תַּחֲנֹק וְתַחֲזוּ בְצִיּוֹן עֵינֵינוּ;
¹² וְהָמָּה לֹא־יָדְעוּ מַחֲשַׁבּוֹת־יְהוָה
וְלֹא הִבִּינוּ עֲצָתוֹ
כִּי־קִבְצָם כַּעֲמִיר גִּרְנָה:

¹³ II קוֹמִי וְדוֹשִׁי בַת־צִיּוֹן
כִּי־קִרְנֶךָ אֲשִׁים בְּרוֹזַל
וּפְרַסְתִּיךָ אֲשִׁים נַחוּשָׁה
וְהִדְקוֹת עַמִּים רַבִּים
וְהִחַרְמַת לִיהוָה בַּעֲצָם
וְחִילָם לֹא־דוֹן כִּלְיָה־אֶרֶץ:

¹⁴ [עֲתָה תִגְדְּרִי בַת־גִּדְדוֹד
מִצּוֹר שָׁמוֹ עָלֵינוּ
בְּשֶׁבֶט יָכוֹ עַל־הַלְחִי
אֶת־שֹׁפֵט יִשְׂרָאֵל:]

Vs. 14 is added here merely for the sake of completeness. There is general agreement that it has no connection with vss. 11-13, but belongs elsewhere. Its closest connection is with 4:9, and it might possibly be placed at the head of that section as the opening strophe; but after all, it seems somewhat superfluous even there, and had better remain unattached. The two strophes of this section present each a phase of the situation which the prophet is depicting, and both together form a complete representation. The text of the passage is practically perfect.

§ 11. THE MESSIANIC KING, 5: 1-3

^{5:1} וְאַתָּה בֵּית אֶפְרַתָּה
הַצֶּעִיר בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה
מִמֶּךָ לִי יֵצֵא

להיות מושל בישראל
 ומוצאתיו מקדם מימי-עולם:
 3 ועמד ורעה בעזייהוה
 בגאון שם-יהוה אלהיו
 כ-יעתה יגדל עד-אפסי-ארץ:

This eight-lined strophe is secured by omitting vs. 2 as a gloss interrupting the connection of vss. 1 and 3; so also Duhm (on Isa. 17:14), Wellhausen, Nowack, and Marti. In line 1 להם is omitted as a gloss (cf. 5); so also Roorda, Pont, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Oort, Marti, *et al.* In line 2 להיות is omitted as a dittograph from line 4. וישבו is dropped from the beginning of line 8 as a gloss made in view of vs. 2; it is also superfluous metrically. Verse 2 reads:

לכן יתנם עד-עת יולדה ילדה
 ויתר אחיו ישובון על-בני ישראל:

§ 12. JUDAH'S FUTURE PROTECTORS FROM ASSYRIA, 5:4, 5

4 והיה זה שלום מאשור
 כי יבא בארצנו
 וכי ידרך באדמתנו
 והקמנו עליו שבעה רעים
 ושמנה נסיכי אדם:
 5 ורעו את-ארץ אשור בחרב
 ואת-ארץ נמרוד בפתיחה
 והצילו מאשור
 כי יבוא בארצנו
 וכי ידרך בגבולנו:

This ten-lined strophe is generally conceded to have no relationship to its immediate context. Reference to any recent commentary will furnish the facts necessary to substantiate the claim of this passage to logical independence. The only new textual element in this arrangement is in the reading מאשור which is

attached to line 1, instead of being read with line 2 as a *casus pendens*. For *שָׁלוֹם מִן* in the sense "protection from," see Zech. 8:10; Job 21:9. The sense thus secured furnishes a complete parallel between the three lines at the opening of the strophe and the three at the close.

§ 13. THE DIVINE EMERGENCE AND IRRESISTIBLE MIGHT
OF THE REMNANT, 5:6-8

וְהָיָה שְׂאִרִית יַעֲקֹב בְּגוֹיִם 6 I

בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים

כְּטֹל מֵאֵת יְהוָה

כְּרַבִּיבִים עָלַי עֹשֶׂה

אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִקְוָה לְאִישׁ

וְלֹא־יִיחַל לְבְנֵי אָדָם:

וְהָיָה שְׂאִרִית יַעֲקֹב בְּגוֹיִם 7 II

בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים

כְּאִרְיָה בְּבַהֲמוֹת יַעַר

כְּכַפִּיר בְּעֹדְרֵי צֹאן

אֲשֶׁר אִם עֹבֵר

וְרִמָּס וְטָרַף וְאִין־מִצִּיל:

תָּרַם יָדָךְ עַל־צִרְיֶךְ 8 III

וְכָל־אִיבֶיךָ יִכְרֹתוּ:

The connection of vs. 8 with vss. 6 and 7 is at the best very loose, even with the change of text from the precatative to the declarative form of the verb. With vs. 9 connection is entirely lacking. The question must present itself as to whether vs. 8 is not a marginal note on vs. 7. The strophic structure supports an affirmative answer.

§ 14. ISRAEL'S PURIFICATION THROUGH CHASTISEMENT,
5:9-14

וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא נִאֲמִי־הוָה 9 I

וְהִכְרַתִּי סוֹסֶיךָ מִקֶּרֶבְךָ

וְהִאֲבֹדְתִי מִרְכַּבְתֶּיךָ:

10 והכרתי ערי ארצך
והרסתי כל מבצריך:

11 II והכרתי כשפים מידך
ומעוננים לא יהיו־לך;
12 והכרתי פסיליך ומצבותיך מקרבך
ולא־תשתחוה עוד למעשה ידיך:

13 [ונתשתי אשיריך מקרבך
והשמדתי עריך;
14 ועשיתי באך ובחמה נקם
את־הגוים אשר לא שמעו:]

This piece consists of two four-line strophes, with an introductory prose line (vs. 9a), and two additional verses from the hands of redactors (vss. 13, 14). Wellhausen and Nowack have already set forth the grounds for athetizing vs. 14. It seems equally clear that vs. 13 must likewise be set aside; 13b as it stands is a weak repetition of vs. 10, and if the common correction to עֲצֻבֶיךָ be made the case is not improved, for it then becomes superfluous after vs. 12; 13a is an editorial insertion of an additional detail in the description. The real climax and natural stopping-point of the piece is at the end of vs. 12; anything additional weakens the effect. Strophe I foretells the destruction of the munitions of war in which Israel puts confidence instead of trusting to Yahweh; Strophe II deals with idolatrous practices which likewise lead Israel away from Yahweh. The assonance of the piece is remarkable, notably in the repetitions of והכרתי and the pronominal suffix הָ.

§ 15. YAHWEH'S CONTROVERSY WITH ISRAEL, 6:1-5

6:1 I שְׁמַע־נָא אֶת הַדְּבָר
אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אָמַר
קוֹם רִיב אֱלֹהֵהֶרִים
וּתְשַׁמְעֵנָה הַגְּבֻעוֹת קוֹלְךָ:

שמעו הרים את־ריב יהוה 2 II

וְהֶאֱזִינִי מִסְדֵּי אֶרֶץ
כִּי־רִיב לַיהוָה עַם־עַמּוֹ
וְעַם יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתּוֹכַח:

עמי מה־עשיתי לך 3 III

וּמַה הִלַּאתִיךָ עֲנֹה־בִי:
כִּי הִעֲלַתִּיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם 4a, b
וּמִבֵּית עֲבָדִים פְּדִיתִיךָ

עמי מה־יעץ בלך 5 IV
וּמַה־עָנָה אַחֲרֵי בִלְעָם
זִכְרֹנָא מִן־הַשְּׁטִימִים עַד־הַגִּלְגַּל
לִמְעַן דַּעַת צְדָקוֹת יְהוָה

In vs. 1a **הַדְּבַר** is added with ⑥; so also Marti. Verse 4c* is eliminated as an editorial expansion of 4b; cf. Marti. The transfer of **זִכְרֹנָא** from vs. 5a to 5c renders 5a parallel in structure to the corresponding line of Strophe III, and also renders 5c susceptible of sensible interpretation. Nowack's omission (Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*) of **מִלֶּךְ מִרְאב** in vs. 5a and **בֶּן־בְּעוֹר** in 5b is adopted for the sake of the meter.

§ 16. THE CONTENT OF TRUE RELIGION, 6:6-8

במה אקדם יהוה 6 I

אֶכֶף לֵאלֹהֵי מָרוֹם
הֶאֱקִדְמִנּוּ בַעֲלוֹת
בַּעֲגָלִים בְּנֵי שִׁנָּה:

הירצה יהוה באלפי אילים 7 II

בִּרְבֻּבוֹת נַחֲלֵי שִׁמְעֹן
הָאֵתָן בְּכוֹרֵי פְשָׁעִי
פָּרִי בִטְנֵי הַטֶּאֱת נִפְשֵׁי:

*Viz. ואשלח לפניך את־משה אהרן ומרים

III 8 הגידילך אדם מה־טוב
ומה־יהוה דורש ממך
כִּי־אם־עשות משפט ואהבת חסד
והצנע לכת עִם־אלהיך:

This section lends itself readily to strophic analysis; no textual changes, transpositions, or omissions are necessary. The opening of the second strophe is marked by the change of subject, and the beginning of the third by the change from question to answer.

§ 17. THE SIN OF JERUSALEM AND THE PUNISHMENT
TO COME, 6:9-16

I 9a, c קול יהוה לעיר יקרא
שמועו מטה ומוֹעֵד הָעִיר:
12a, b אשר עשיריה מלאו חמס
וישביה דברו שקר
II 10 הָאִשָּׁה בִּית־רשע אֲצִרוֹת
ואיפת רזון זעומה:
11 הָאֲזִנָּה בַּמַּאֲזִנִּי רשע
ובליס אבני מרמה:
III 13a וגם־אני הִחֲלֹתִי הַכּוֹתֵךְ
13b, 14b הַשָּׁמַיִם עַל־הַטְּאוֹתֶיךָ וישחך בקרבך
14c, d וחסג ולא תפליט
ואשר תפלט לחרב אתך:
IV 14a אתה תאכל ולא תשבע
15 אתה תזרע ולא תקצור
אתה תדרך־זית ולא־תסוך שמן
ותירוש ולא תשתה־יין:
V 16 וְהַשֹּׁמֵר הַקּוֹת עמרי
וכל מעשה בית־אחאב
למען תתי אתך לשמה
וישביה לשרקה

Strophes I and II denounce the sins of Jerusalem; Strophes III and IV announce the consequent punishment; and Strophe V summarizes both sin and punishment. This arrangement is essentially that of Marti, though certain elements in it (viz., the elision of vs. 9*b* as a late gloss, the transposition of vs. 12*a, b* to follow vs. 9, and the transposition of vs. 14*a* to precede vs. 15*a*) had commended themselves to me before seeing Marti's treatment. In vs. 10*a* the final רשע is dropped as a dittograph. Verse 12*c* is a gloss on 12*b*. The transposition of vs. 14*a* leaves 14*b* to be joined to vs. 13*b*, and suggests some meaning for ישהך (or its original) parallel to חטאתיך; Marti's conjectural correction to אשר is not felicitous. The glosses, vs. 16*c*, ותלכו במעצותם, and 16*f*, והרפת עמים תשאו, are also omitted, with Marti.

§ 18. THE TOTAL CORRUPTION OF THE PEOPLE, 7:1-6

אלל־לי כי הייתי 7:1 I
כאספ־קיץ כעללת בציר
אין אשכול לאכל
בכורה אותה נפשי:

אבד חסיד מן־הארץ 2 II
וישר באדם אין
כלם לדמים יארבו
איש את־אחיהו יצודו חרם:

לְהָרֵעַ פְּפִיָּהֶם הַיָּטִיבוּ 3 III
השר שאל בשלום
והגדול דבר הות־נפשו
הוא ויעבתוה:

טובם כחדק 4 IV
יִשָּׁרֵם כְּמִסְכָּה
יום פקדתם באה
עתה תהיה מבוכתם:

אל האמינו ברע 5 v
אל תבטחו באלוף
משכבת חיקך
שמר פתחי פיך:

כי־בן מנבל אב 6 vi
בת קמה באמה
כלה בחמתה
איבי איש אנשי ביתו:

In this passage vs. 3 has become almost unintelligible according to MT; in 3a להרע is read with Marti and Nowack (in Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*); כפיהם is the reading of GSY; הטיבו is read with GY, Bauer, Taylor, Wellhausen, Nowack, and Marti. In vs. 3b והשפט is omitted as a gloss upon השר; the renderings of the versions point in this direction; it is unnecessary to include the preposition ב in the gloss as do Marti and Nowack, for שאל ב is a good Hebrew idiom. The original reading of vs. 3d seems beyond recovery; Marti's והמשפט makes good sense, but is too remote from נפשו הוא. In vs. 4c מצפוך is omitted as a euphemistic gloss on פקדחם.

§ 19. THE DISCOMFITURE OF THE FOE, 7:7-10

אל־תשמחי איבתי לי 8 I
כי נפלתי קמתי
כי אשב בחשך
יהוה אור לי:

זעק יהוה אשא 9 II
כי חטאתי לו
עד־אשר יריב ריבי
ועשה משפטי

יוציאני לאור III
אראה בצדקתו:
ותרא איבתי 10
ותכסה בושה

הַאֲמִירָה אֵלַי IV
 אִיו יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 עֵינֵי תְּרַאֲנֶנָּה בָּהּ
 עַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לְמִרְמָס:

Verse 7 is a three-lined stanza which is omitted here as an interpolation designed to furnish a closer connection between vss. 1-6 and vss. 8-10. Its text runs:

וְאֵנִי בִיהוָה אֶצְפֶּה
 אֶוֹחִילָה לְאֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 יִשְׁמַעֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי:

The dimeter movement is marked in vss. 8-10; the verses might be grouped into two tetrameter strophes, but both metrically and logically the present arrangement seems preferable. The words כְּטִיט הַדְּצִוֹת are omitted from vs. 10 as a gloss; so Marti and Nowack (in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*).

§ 20. THE IMMINENT RETURN OF THE EXILES AND THE VINDICATION OF YAHWEH, 7:11-13

יִּיּוֹם הוּא לְבָנוֹת גְּדִירֶךָ 11
 הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוּא יִרְחַק־חֶקֶק:
 יִּיּוֹם הוּא וְעֵדֶיךָ יָבוֹאוּ 12
 לִמְנֵי אֲשׁוּר וְעֵדֶי מִצּוֹר
 וּלְמֵנִי מִצּוֹר וְעֵד־נֶהָר
 וַיּוֹם מִיָּם וְהָרַר מִקֶּהָר:
 וְהִיתָה הָאָרֶץ לְשִׁמְמָה 13
 עַל־יִשְׁבִּיָּה מִפְּרִי מַעַלְלֵיהֶם:

The general meaning of this eight-lined strophe is quite clear, and it is complete in itself. It seems therefore unnecessary to convert it into the first person throughout in order to make possible its connection with vss. 7-10, as do Marti and Nowack (but cf. Stade, *ZAW*, XXIII, 164 ff.). Such promises for the future

are usually addressed to the community rather than uttered by the community itself. Connection with vss. 7–10 is, to be sure, impossible without the change of person; but is connection indispensable in such a collection of fragments as chaps. 6 and 7 seem to be?

§ 21. A PRAYER FOR YAHWEH'S INTERPOSITION IN
ISRAEL'S BEHALF, 7:14–20

רעה עמך בשבטך צאן נחלתך ¹⁴ I
שכני לבדד יער בתוך כרמל
ירעו בשן וגלעד כימי עולם:
כימי צאתך ממצרים הראני נפלאות: ¹⁵

יראו גוים ויבשו מכל גבורתם ¹⁶ II
ישימו יד על־פה אזניהם תחרשנה:
ילחכו עפר כנחש כזחלי ארץ ¹⁷
ירגזו ממסגרתיהם יפחדו ויראו ממך:

מִי־אֵל כְּמוֹךָ נָשָׂא עוֹן וְעָבַר עַל־פֶּשַׁע ^{18a} III
וְתִשְׁלֹךְ בַּמִּצְלוֹת יָם כָּל הַטְּאִתָּיִו ^{19b}
תִּתֵּן אֲמֶת לִיעֲקֹב חֶסֶד לְאַבְרָהָם ²⁰
אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעַת לְאַבְתָּיו מִיָּמֵי קֶדֶם:

The *Qinah* movement prevails throughout this final section; only three lines need pruning to bring them within the limits of the meter, viz. Strophe I, line 4, from which ארץ is excised, with Ⓞ; Strophe II, line 4, from which אֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ is removed as a gloss, with Nowack and Marti; and Strophe III, line 1, from which לְשֹׂאֲרֵית נַחֲלָתוֹ is dropped as an editorial expansion, also with Nowack and Marti. Stade (*ZAW*, XXIII, 164 ff.), followed by Nowack and Marti, rightly recognized that vss. 18b, 19a interrupted the close connection between 18a and 19b, and that discovery is taken advantage of in this arrangement. But these dislodged fragments cannot legitimately be attached to vss. 11–13 as forming the conclusion of the passage,

vss. 7-13. They are better treated as a parallel, or variant, to vss. 18*a*, 19*b*. The text runs as follows:

לא החזיק לעד אפר 18*b*
 כי חפץ חסד הוא:
 ישוב ירחמנו יכבוש עונותינו 19*a*

This isolated usage of כבש raises the question whether it may not be an error for כבס, which furnishes a good meaning here and an idiom familiar to all readers of the Old Testament (e. g., Ps. 51:4, 9; cf. Isa. 1:16; 4:4), though it is true that כבס itself never appears with a word for "sin" constituting the direct object as here.

Date Due		
MAY 11 1984		
FACULTY		
JUN 1 1985		
JUN 1 1986		
JUN 1 1987		
OCT 18 1988		



BS1192 .044 v.2
Old Testament and Semitic studies in

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00011 9273